Euripides and the Language of Craft

MARY STIEBER

MNEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTS MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BRILL

Euripides and the Language of Craft

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and Latin Language and Literature

Editorial Board

G.J. Boter
A. Chaniotis
K.M. Coleman
I.J.F. de Jong
T. Reinhardt

VOLUME 327

Euripides and the Language of Craft

By

Mary Stieber

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2011

On the cover: Red-figure olpe from Capua showing Athena fashioning a horse, ca. 470 B.C., (Berlin F 2415). With kind permission of the Berliner Antikenmuseum.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Stieber, Mary C. (Mary Clorinda)
Euripides and the language of craft / by Mary Stieber.
p. cm. – (Mnemosyne supplements. Monographs on Greek and Roman language and literature, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 327)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-18906-5 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Euripides–Literary style. 2. Euripides–Language. 3. Euripides–Knowledge–Art. 4. Visual perception in literature. 5. Allusions in literature. I. Title.

PA3992.S75 2011
882'.01–dc22

2010041730

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978 90 04 18906 5

Copyright 2011 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vii
Preface ix
Abbreviations xxv

Chapter One: Architecture 1
Introduction 1
The Topography of the City 12
Walls 16
The Language of Architecture 23
Foundations 24
Columns and Supporting Members 36
Superstructures 48
τοῖχος/τεῖχος 84
"Cyclopean" Masonry 90
πυργόω 104
Conclusion 110

Chapter Two: Sculpture 115
Introduction 115
ἄγαλμα and ἀγάλματα 116
The Aesthetics of Statuary 145
Her Living Image 162
Wiped Clean 172
A Crown of Glory 178
The Wooden Horse 185
Conclusion 192

Chapter Three: Painting 195
Introduction 195
Landscape in *Phaethon*'s "Dawn-song" 203
Polyxena, Again 215
Paintings as Instructors 218
Further Technical Developments 232
Vase-painting 241
The Portrayal of Character 255

Ganymede ... 267
Conclusion ... 273

Chapter Four: *Ion* ... 275
Introduction ... 275
Ion and the Acropolis ... 278
The Ekphrasis of the Parodos ... 284
The Tent ... 302
The Art of Weaving ... 315
The Peplos ... 321
Many-colored Threads ... 325
Weaving Metaphors ... 331
Conclusion ... 334

Chapter Five: A Practiced Hand ... 337
Introduction ... 337
In the Studio ... 340
The Language of Art Criticism ... 360
σχῆμα ... 361
ῥυθμός/εὐρύθμως ... 365
ἰδέα ... 371
παράδειγμα ... 372
τύπος ... 373
κανών and στάθμη ... 380
μίμημα and μιμέομαι ... 397
Wonderworking ... 400
The Hand That is Σοφός ... 415
Conclusion ... 426

Epilogue ... 429

Works Cited ... 435

General Index ... 461
Euripides Passage Index ... 485

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to various individuals and groups who, over the years, have helped in one way or another to bring this project to fruition. First and foremost, for his support from its inception until just short of its completion, to John Walsh, together with whom I read all of Euripides' extant plays and most of the longer fragments in the early stages of gathering material. I am also indebted to John for the example set by his own scholarship. To my colleague Brian Swann, for unflagging encouragement especially through the most trying of times and, though Greek is not his field, who gamely read several portions of the text and made useful suggestions from an experienced literary critical perspective. To the organizers of the Banff conference on Euripides in 1999, Martin Cropp and the late Kevin Lee, who, when I had just begun work, offered me the opportunity to present my preliminary findings at a major international conference, and encouraged me to follow through on the project. To my former student Eduardo Escobar, for reading portions of the manuscript and tracking down some last minute references. To the countless libraries who were willing to lend their materials; without the services of Interlibrary Loan I would not have been able to conduct my research. At my home institution, for their assistance, advice, and understanding in the publication phase of the project, special thanks are due to Catherine Siemann, my indexer, Katherine Apolito, Bill Germano, and Hadi Jammal. The editors at Brill, especially Caroline van Erp, were as efficient and patient as can be. Thanks also to Brill's two anonymous referees, a philologist and an archaeologist, whose invaluable suggestions, comments, and corrections have been incorporated into the text and notes, without acknowledgement. I hope they will notice in the finished product where and how I have followed through on each one of their expert observations. Finally, to all the truly great Euripideans, whose work is acknowledged throughout, who have graciously made room for an interdisciplinary interloper. I hope that my own contribution will serve as a not unworthy tribute to theirs.

PREFACE

The extant works of the three major fifth-century tragedians offer a rich and relatively untapped resource for understanding how Classical Greeks responded to their visual arts. While there have been many studies of the influences of contemporary politics, current events, and social issues on the Athenian dramatists,[1] few have been devoted to if and how the material culture with which the playwrights interacted on a daily basis found its way into their works. This is a study of one tragic poet, Euripides, and his relationship with the visual arts. Why focus on Euripides, among the three great Athenian tragedians? The answer is simple: He refers or alludes to art and architecture more often, more tangibly, and with a keener eye for accuracy than either of his two compatriots, Aeschylus or Sophocles. For the dramatist most attuned to the expansive visual culture of his era, it offered an array of alternative aesthetic viewpoints, some convenient tropes and plot devices, and a vocabulary rich with metaphoric and figurative potential. We shall explore all of these categories in the pages that follow.

In the course of a relatively short history, research on the relationships between the ancient dramatists and the visual arts has tended to concentrate on the identification and interpretation of scenes from plays ostensibly depicted in works of art, especially vase paintings, those from the Greek West in the fourth century BC being the richest in number and content.[2] With Euripides the most popular of the playwrights, it follows that his works proved most popular as subject matter for contemporary and later artists. Studies of this type assume that the artists were inspired by contemporary public performances of plays, their primary goal being to uncover evidence for the plots and action of plays both preserved and lost, for the costuming of actors, dancing, music, and other stage

---

[1] E.g., Justina Gregory, *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians* (Ann Arbor, 1997); Christian Meier, *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*, trans. Andrew Webber (Baltimore, MD, 1993). Donald J. Mastronarde, *The Art of Euripides. Dramatic Technique and Social Context* (Cambridge, Eng., and New York, 2010), came to my attention too late to consult.

[2] See, most recently, Oliver Taplin, *Pots & Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B. C.* (Los Angeles, CA, 2007), who acknowledges (p. x) the pioneering work of A.D. Trendall in this field of study.

business, in other words, to probe artifacts for their value as primary evidence for the history of ancient drama. Such studies rightly regard the visual arts as bearers of otherwise unrecoverable information about an entirely separate art form. But justification also exists for the reverse approach, that is, for seeking signs in the plays that suggest that the visual arts have influenced the playwright and, consequently, that inspiration as well as information flowed as regularly from artwork to poet as in the opposite direction, an enterprise that Walter Miller, one of its earliest proponents, aptly labeled "la philologie archéologique."[3] With this approach, objects retain their integrity as art works and artifacts and the verbal appropriations are scrutinized for the light they shed on the ancient view of ancient art, from the unique perspective afforded by the lens of the poet.

Some fine work has been conducted from the "reverse perspective;" Euripides in particular has been its beneficiary. Miller's three-volume *Daedalus and Thespis. The Contributions of the Ancient Dramatic Poets to Our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts of Greece* (New York, 1929–1932), is noteworthy for its encyclopedic approach to a developing interdisciplinary scholarly genre. Few Euripidean references have been missed by the author's fine-toothed comb. However, because of its breadth of coverage (all of the poets, with separate volumes devoted to architecture and topography, sculpture, and painting; the minor arts are included as well) and its essentially archaeological approach, Miller leaves himself little room for extended interpretation and analysis of individual passages. Even so it remains a useful reference work. The scholar most deserving of the title "pioneer" in this field, however, is T.B.L. Webster, whose *Greek Art and Literature 530–400 B. C.* (Oxford, 1939) covers the period in question, and who devoted much of his career to interdisciplinary research, from both directions, when it was neither fashionable nor necessarily respectable for a classical philologist to do so. His work is at long last being recognized as ahead of its time.[4] Monographic stud-

---

[3] Walter Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis. The Contributions of the Ancient Dramatic Poets to Our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts of Greece*, 1–3 (New York and Columbia, MI, 1929–1932), p. 809, where, having reached the end of his work, the author reflects upon the groundbreaking nature of his enterprise: "It has been the purpose of this work to establish only the influence of the artists upon the poets and their reaction to that influence. The influence of the poets upon the artists is necessarily discussed in every history of art and has received special treatment in various publications, large and small."

[4] See, e. g., Axel Seeberg, "Tragedy and Archaeology, Forty Years After," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 46 (2002–2003), 43–75, the substance of a lecture delivered

ies in this area have been more plentiful in German-language scholarship. Worthy of mention are Gottfried Kinkel's early work, *Euripides und die bildende Kunst* (Berlin, 1871), which focuses exclusively on our poet, while Dietram Müller's *Handwerk und Sprache* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1974), a compilation of technical references to crafts and artisanal language throughout Greek literature, includes much material on Euripides. As the present project nears publication, the interrelationships between literature and art have become a major area of scholarly concern among English-language classicists such as Gloria Ferrari, Rush Rehm, Deborah Steiner, and Froma Zeitlin, whose works exemplify the wide range of contemporary approaches and are consequently cited throughout. On the other hand, art historians and archaeologists who have tackled the topic are in short supply, a discrepancy the present study is intended to begin to redress.[5]

Nor am I the first to deduce Euripides' superiority in matters artistic. In 1898 John H. Huddilston devoted sixty-seven pages of a modest, yet prescient little monograph, titled *The Attitude of the Greek Tragedians Toward Art*, to the playwright, with Aeschylus running a distant second, at twenty-seven pages, and Sophocles virtually a non-starter (six pages). Its author is forced to admit that "[Aeschylus and Sophocles] … have been included here not so much for what they have to give us in an archaeological way as to lend a sort of completeness to the discussion and to form a basis of comparison for Euripides by the study of whom I was drawn into the investigation."[6] Somewhat later, in a far more ambitious study, Miller would reach the same conclusion: "All the tragic poets exercised an influence upon the art of their own and of succeeding centuries. All of them were influenced by the art of the centuries that preceded them. Sophocles … has the fewest allusions to matters of

---

in honor of T.B.L. Webster on the occasion of a re-issuing of one of his works. Likewise, Oliver Taplin's engaging talk at the 1999 Banff conference drew attention to Webster's unique and still mostly unheralded contribution to classical studies.

[5] To be clear, the "archaeological" side of E.—his topographical references, allusions to cult and cult practices, and such matters whose historical accuracy is open to corroboration through Pausanias and other writers as well as fieldwork—has never escaped the notice of commentators, not to mention archaeologists who have used E. as primary evidence for their theses; e.g., Joan B. Connelly, "Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze," *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996), 53–80.

[6] John H. Huddilston, *The Attitude of the Greek Tragedians Toward Art* (London, 1898), p. viii.

art; Aeschylus has considerably more; and Euripides by far the most."[7] Huddilston's explanation for the discrepancies in interest, though not without merit, involved a romanticized assessment of the playwrights' respective lifetimes and failed to account for Sophocles: "It must be borne in mind that the older poet [Aeschylus] belonged to quite a different age in the history of Greek art, and that therefore he can not be required to exhibit the cultivated judgement of the younger poet [Euripides] who breathed under the influence of the Pheidian age."[8] In truth, however, the divergent attitudes to the visual arts discernible among the three tragedians may owe as much to artistic temperament and literary style as to the spirit of the age.

While such high-flying rhetoric has been out of fashion for some time, that the visual arts flourished in the Athens of the second half of the fifth century BC to a rare and unparalleled degree is not in doubt. However, a slim possibility exists that something more concrete lies behind Euripides' interest in the visual arts to account for its extending well beyond that of his "golden age" contemporary, Sophocles. While it must be treated with great caution, an anecdote preserved in the ancient *Life of Euripides* (*TrGF* 5, T A 1 IA. 4) records that "word had it" (φασι) that Euripides was "also a painter" (αὐτὸν καὶ ζωγράφον) whose works were of sufficient quality to be exhibited at Megara, although whether or not this last is flattering or damning, we cannot know.[9]

---

[7] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 809. The same conclusion may be drawn from the amount of attention, proportionately, given by Hanna Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala. Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk in vorplatonischen Schrifttum* (Berlin, 1968), to the three tragedians: E., by far the most, with A., a rather distant second; she has almost nothing to say of S.'s interest in the visual arts. These differences are conveyed most starkly in her list of ancient works cited. Much the same pattern emerges in Dietram Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache. Die sprachlichen Bilder aus dem Bereich des Handwerks in der griechischen Literature bis 400 v. Chr.* (Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie) 51 (Meisenheim am Glan, 1974), although he includes significantly more material from S.; it should be noted, however, that Müller does not limit his field to the fine arts. Müller, op. cit., pp. 325–328, summarizes the use of handicraft imagery in the three tragedians, but offers little in the way of comparative analysis.

[8] Huddilston, *Attitude of the Greek Tragedians*, p. 106. More recently, Willi Drost, "Strrukturwandel der griechischen Kunst im Zeitalter des Euripides," *Gymnasium* 77 (1970), 375–391, attempts to demonstrate much the same point with far greater elaboration and substantiation, although he does not develop the connections with E.'s art as fully as one might wish.

[9] For a convenient trans. of the *Vita*, see Mary R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore, MD, 1981), pp. 163–169 (164 and 168, for the passages in question). As

Elsewhere in the *Vita* (*TrGF* 5, T A 1 IB. 2) we hear (φασι, again) that he was a painter "first" (κατ' ἀρχάς), turning to tragedy only after he had studied with Archelaos, the natural philosopher, and Anaxagoras. Most scholars assume, with justification, that many if not most of the anecdotes preserved in the *Vita* are fictions derived from elements in Euripides' own plays and old comedic parody of the playwright and his works.[10] Yet, while the reports of his connections with philosophers, for instance, may be tested against dates and evidence from other sources, raising legitimate doubts about their accuracy, there is simply no comparable way to test the authenticity of the claim of an aborted career as a painter; as a result, I submit that it ought not to be rejected out of hand.[11] Ion of Chios, who was gathering and compiling anecdotal material about the tragedians already in the fifth century while two of them were still alive,[12] might be the source for some of these anecdotes, suggesting that at least a few stand a reasonable chance of authenticity. Moreover, there was far less at stake in the claim that Euripides was a painter than in the claim that he mingled with philosophers; an association with the avant garde thinkers of the day would put our playwright in elite intellectual company and aid in explaining some of the ideas put into the mouths of characters in his plays. In the end we must ask: If the story about being a painter is untrue, why ever was it fabricated?

Lefkowitz, op. cit., pp. 102–103, observes of the *Vit. Eur.*, "precise dating is impossible." While what we have is definitely "later" (the basic format "could have been set been set as early as the second century BC," according to Lefkowitz, loc. cit.) the various components may be dated to the fourth and third centuries BC (Lefkowitz, op. cit., p. 88) and were based upon even earlier original material: "The Euripides *Vita* is made up of anecdotes created in or soon after the poet's lifetime ..." (Lefkowitz, op cit., p. 102). David Kovacs' (*Euripides*, 1 [1994; repr. Cambridge, MA, and London, 2001], pp. 1–22) recent summary analysis of the biographical tradition surrounding E. is sobering, but he is perhaps overly cautious in his nearly universal agnosticism. In general, on the pitfalls of treating the ancient *Lives* as evidence, see Lefkowitz, op. cit., passim; Janet Fairweather, "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers," *Ancient Society* 5 (1974), 231–275.

10 Lefkowitz, *Lives*, pp. 88–104, esp. 88 and 102; Kovacs, *Euripides*, 1, pp. 1–32, passim.

11 Thus, Kovacs, *Euripides*, 1, p. 10, rejects the association with Anaxagoras, but does not mention the anecdotes about E.'s being a painter. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 44, is willing to entertain a connection between the anecdote and E.'s interest in the visual arts, with caution.

12 Lefkowitz, *Lives*, pp. 67–68 and 80–82 (on anecdotes about A. and S.). While Ion it seems spent his entire life on Chios, it is possible that he and S. met while the latter was visiting for political purposes, according to various authors in Victoria Jennings and Andrea Katsaros, eds., *The World of Ion of Chios* (Leiden and Boston, 2007), pp. 117–119, 123–124, 173, and 269, as well as passim, Part 2: "Ion *Sungrapheos*."

A suspiciously similar claim was made concerning Euripides' contemporary, Socrates, whose father, Sophroniscus, was said to be a stonemason or a sculptor and who himself is said to have taken up sculpting.[13] If untrue, the source of inspiration is not hard to identify: reports by contemporaries of Socrates' poking his nose into artisans' studios and asking questions.[14] Likewise, with Euripides, even if there is no truth whatsoever to the reports in the *Vita*, then the circular argument is itself enlightening: For such rumors to have evolved through familiarity with the content of his plays offers strong supporting evidence that Euripides' interest in the visual arts was made apparent *in the plays*, presumably including those lost to us. Significantly, no such stories became attached to the name of Aeschylus. While Sophocles' father was said by earlier biographers to have been variously a carpenter or a metalworker, these claims were refuted by the compiler of his *Vita*.[15] Why would such stories become attached selectively to Euripides and Socrates rather than to Aeschylus or Sophocles, if not based upon the most direct available evidence of their interests, whether their lives, their works (at least in the case of the playwright), or both? On the other hand, if by chance the reports of Euripides' having been a painter are true, it follows naturally that his works, perhaps more than those of any other Greek poet outside of Homer, are full of well-informed, technically lucid references and allusions to the visual arts.

On very few occasions, however, are these references made explicit, that is, to specific, identifiable works of art and architecture. As a result, there is little call for accompanying illustrations in the present volume, which could suggest a specificity that is not there. Rather than an "archaeology" of Euripides, which it originally set out to be, in essence this is a study of a specialized class of poetic *imagery*, "Bildersprache," a topic that German-language scholars in particular have taken up with vigor. Full-length treatments that focus exclusively on Euripides, though not solely on the visual arts, include Wilhelm Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideische Lyrick* (Stuttgart, 1934), Karl Pauer's doc-

[13] E.g., D.L. 2. 18; at Pl. *Euthphr.* 11c, Socrates lightheartedly claims Daidalos as an ancestor; for additional sources and discussion, see G. Lippold, *RE* 2 ser. III, col. 1104; J. Stenzel, *RE* 2 ser. III, col. 812; W.K.C. Guthrie, *Socrates* (Cambridge, Eng., 1971), pp. 58–59; Fairweather, "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers," p. 251, with n. 100.

[14] E.g., Xen. *Mem.* 3. 10. 3–5, to be discussed below.

[15] Lefkowitz, *Lives*, p. 75, with sources.

toral dissertation, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides* (Breslau, 1935) and, more recently, Ewald Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise in den Tragödien des Euripides* (Amsterdam, 1985).[16] English studies in this category are dominated by Shirley A. Barlow's *The Imagery of Euripides: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language* (1971; 2nd ed. Bristol, 1986). I could not agree more with Zeitlin: "No one who approaches the topic of visual effects in Euripides can fail to acknowledge the remarkable work of Shirley Barlow . . . , whose organization of the subject and acute analyses of the relevant texts remain a landmark in Euripidean criticism."[17] In Barlow's work I encountered perceptive commentary on virtually every passage of poetry I undertook to treat; she was there before me on nearly every occasion, and is liberally acknowledged as well she should be in the following pages.

Whether through references or allusions to actual objects, through motifs built around real or imaginary objects, or through technical or figurative phraseology, Euripides regularly exploits language's power to create an image. He does this not for synaesthetic effect, as Aeschylus, might, but to trigger a coherent visual response in the mind's eye of an audience equipped, for the most part, to recognize the references. "The poet's imagination," Barlow observes, "finds expression primarily through appeal to the sense of sight," as she herself demonstrates again and again Euripides' preoccupation with the visual aspects of his dramas, not the least in his attention to physical description and the personal appearances of characters.[18] However, I am less concerned than

---

[16] Pauer, op. cit, p. 70, is not particularly impressed with Euripidean imagery associated with "Handwerk" and "Kunst" (under which he includes music and poetry), and consequently does not spend much time on it (pp. 70–74 and 103–107). Kurtz, op. cit., pp. 1–34, reviews earlier studies in this category; in contrast, his is less catalog-like and devotes more space to interpretation. In general Kurtz' literary and theoretical approach renders his work less relevant and useful for the topic at hand; moreover, because it is much more broadly based, it addresses only a relatively small percentage of the imagery discussed below. With but a brief section dedicated exclusively to arts and crafts (pp. 546–553), accompanied by cursory commentary, it is fair to say that Kurtz too is not especially interested in the category of imagery under present considertation. Also worthy of mention is M. de F. Sousa e Silva, "Elementos visuais e pictóricos na tragédia de Eurípides," *Humanitas* 37–38 (1985–1986), 9–86.

[17] Froma Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre," in *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne, eds. (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), pp. 138–196, p. 296, n. 17.

[18] Shirley A. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides. A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language* (1971; 2nd ed. Bristol, 1986), p. 120 (quotation), 79–95, and 129.

Barlow and others with the meaning and significance of the images within the dramas than in their cumulative function as images *per se*. For craft is ultimately what the present study is about. As it is, Euripides' habit of deploying the *language of craft* also exposes a great deal about his *craft of language*. There is a larger picture, as well. More than just a compendium of Euripidean passages that can be associated with the visual arts, the present work offers a much-needed synthetic view of the multiple ways in which Euripides was able to place his technical and practical knowledge at the service of his poetry. Through meticulous dissection of the sometimes arcane qualities of Euripides' technically inflected language and its potential range of meanings, this study reflects ultimately not only upon the timeless dialogue between text and image, image and text, but between text *as* image, image *as* text. In addition, while it assumes that readers of Euripides' plays will be familiar with many of the passages in question as dramatic and literary texts, the present approach contributes to the wider idea that tragedy extends beyond the theater to incorporate important aspects of Athenian cultural and intellectual life.

Whatever his motivation, the playwright alert to the rich vocabulary and complex realities of fifth-century visual culture is, in short, a man of his time, fair to say, a "modernist." This proclivity of Euripides' was noted by contemporaries, though with more censure than praise. At *Frogs* 959–961 Aristophanes' character, Euripides, admits to introducing into his plays οἰκεῖα πράγματα ("the things of everyday life"), in order that his τέχνη ("craft") would be able to withstand the test of accuracy when confronted by knowledgeable critics, that is, his audience, who would have been familiar with such things: οἰκεῖα πράγματ' εἰσάγων, οἷς χρώμεθ', οἷς ξύνεσμεν, / ἐξ ὧν γ' ἂν ἐξηλεγχόμην· ξυνειδότες γὰρ οὗτοι / ἤλεγχον ἄν μου τὴν τέχνην· ("introducing familiar things, that we use, that we live with, by which I would be brought to the test; for these, the knowledgeable ones, would cross-examine my craft"). I submit that τέχνη here conveys a triple allusion: first, to Euripides' own art, that is, the art of tragic poetry (cf. *Ra*. 780, 850, 1495, and passim); second, to Euripides' poetic characterizations of "the things of everyday life"; and third, to the crafted objects and the artisanal language that Euripides introduced into his poetry. Let me point out that the language of craft is not the language of rhetoric or philosophy in later fifth-century Athens; as technical as it is, it can still be considered "everyday" because it is borrowed from the domain of artisans. Such things would undoubtedly fall under the πάσας τέχνας that Plato/Socrates would criticize both

Homer and the tragedians for "knowing" (ἐπίστανται), without being able to demonstrate expertise in each of them individually (*Rep.* 10. 598d–599a; *Ion*, passim).[19]

Aristotle (*Rh.* 1404b. 28–30), evidently with admiration, points to the artfulness behind Euripides' choice and deployment (ἐκλέγων συντιθῇ) of "the language of the everyday" (εἰωθυίας διαλέκτου), and considers him the first to do so, showing the way for others. So too "Longinus" (40. 2–4) includes Euripides among the poets and other authors who use "common and hackneyed words" (κοινοῖς καὶ δημώδεσι τοῖς ὀνόμασι), sometimes to lofty and magnificent effect.[20] He specifies: ἐν τοῖς πλεί-στοις Εὐριπίδης. Even Aristophanes had to acknowledge that this habit does not necessarily compromise Euripides' poetics. As Art L. Spisak has observed, Euripides in *Frogs* is judged to speak clearly (v. 1434) and "on an understandable and rational level" (v. 1058), while his style is characterized by the not unflattering term λεπτός or compounds thereof (vv. 828, 876, 956, and so forth) and he is considered a "polished crafts-man" (vv. 802, 819, 826, and so forth).[21] Assuming that Aristophanes' attempt at humor is dependent upon authentic contemporary views of Euripides' style, and that Aristophanes above all should know, his own works being full of οἰκεῖα πράγματα, the present study proceeds on the premise of Euripides' attested interest in the *genre* element, as manifested in his choice of language borrowed from the everyday—"Alltagssprache," if you prefer—a component of literature otherwise known plain and simply as "realism."[22]

A concern for realism led Euripides, for instance, to recast in his *Electra* (vv. 527–537) the recognition scene between Orestes and Electra in Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers* (vv. 174–211) in order to correct (and possibly critique) the assumption of his predecessor that a brother and a sister would have the same hair and foot size. It prompted an aside on the sound of castanets (κορτάλων) to amuse a baby in *Hypsipyle* (fr. 752 f. 8), mocked by Aristophanes in *Frogs* as "potsherds" (ὀστράκοις) in a parody

---

[19] On which see David Roochnik, *Of Art and Wisdom. Plato's Understanding of Techne* (University Park, PA, 1996), pp. 196–197.

[20] On E.'s "Alltagssprache," see Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 489–492.

[21] Art L. Spisak, "Martial 6. 61: Callimachean Poetics Revalued," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994), 291–308 (295).

[22] It has become almost a cliché to consider E. a realist. The OCD entry by J.P.A. Gould has subheading, "Realism" (in quotes). See also, e.g., Victor Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy* (New York, 1962), p. 12; Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 80–81 and 108; Nancy S. Rabinowitz, *Anxiety Veiled. Euripides and the Traffic in Women* (Ithaca and London, 1993), p. 13.

of the scene (vv. 1305–1307).[23] It motivated an unforgettable vignette of the Phrygian slave in *Orestes*—one of the most developed minor character portraits in tragedy—fanning Helen with a meticulously described, proper Asiatic "punkah" with its circle of plumes (vv. 1427–1430).[24] Countless other examples could be cited. The same level of concern is evident in his references to art and architecture. In spite of the vaunted realism, however, Euripides was neither historian nor archaeologist, and there is no reason to expect archaeological precision from him. Yet it must be said that there is a lot of workable space between archaeological precision and careless, gratuitous anachronism. Hence, in lieu of an authentic Bronze age monument, the preference for something merely suggestive of "older" to a contemporary monument or model—though Euripides is not beyond alluding to contemporary or "modern" works of art and architecture, as we shall see. Homer was regarded as a reliable source for Bronze age culture and artifacts in the fifth century. Scholars have long recognized that the Homeric poems are a gold mine and a paradigm for precise and detailed technical language and imagery. It follows that a portion of the artisanal vocabulary used by Euripides has a Homeric provenance,[25] and that, like Homer, Euripides' interest in the visual arts and crafts betrays an underlying concern with confronting the mechanics of his own art, the art of poetry, and serves as a reminder that poets are craftsmen, too.

In an interdisciplinary project such as this that attempts to identify language associated with the visual arts in the output of a someone who made his living as a wordsmith, there is always the danger of misjudging both the original intent and the reception of a given word or term. This is especially true when the word in question has multiple applications, only one of which is technical. What requires that the technical meaning of a word or term be regarded as primary in the second half of the fifth century, and how do we know that Euripides, when he wrote it, and his audience, when they heard it uttered in the theater, understood and duly appreciated the technical ramifications of its appropriation in the context at hand? Did all audience members "hear" the technical side, even when it

[23] M.J. Cropp in C. Collard, M.J. Cropp, and J. Gibert, eds., *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays*, 2 (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 2004) [hereafter cited as Collard, Cropp, and Gibert], p. 231.

[24] As identified by C.W. Willink, *Euripides Orestes* (Oxford, 1986), p. 317.

[25] See, e.g., K. Lange, *Euripides und Homer. Untersuchungen zur Homernachwirkung in Elektra, Iphigenie in Taurerland, Helena, Orestes und Kyklops*, (Hermes Einzelschriften) 86 (Stuttgart, 2002).

was the intended? Could in fact an audience be led to "hear" the technical content of a word? A number of these terms are common enough in Greek literature that, fair to say, by the late fifth century they could have lost their original craft connotations altogether and were no longer even heard or read as metaphors or figurative language.

There are no foolproof answers to these questions. From a linguistic standpoint, even when a term is found on multiple occasions, for instance, in a building inscription from the later fifth century or early fourth, there is no guarantee that the technical application of the term inspired the figurative or metaphorical, rather than the other way around. Counterintuitive though I find it, in hope of erring least, I have tried not to make claims of technical priority when there is no direct evidence thereof. However, it does not take a linguist to notice that artisinal terminology is regularly appropriated for a wide range of other, nontechnical purposes in many languages, ancient and modern. Often it is relatively easy to detect a chronological pattern in an LSJ entry: Usage generally moves from specific to abstract, but then so does thought, in ancient Greece as elsewhere. Things are somewhat simpler when the term is Homeric; technical usage there strongly suggests that it moved from technical to figurative.

Nonetheless, it is best to reserve judgment about priority of meaning except in the most obvious cases. In the end this issue may be a red-herring. Central to my overall thesis is not whether the technical or the metaphorical can be shown to have been the "primary" sense of a term under consideration, or even which was primary in the fifth century, but rather that Euripides so often chooses language that has a technical dimension. Whereas in ordinary speech, one might inadvertently use a metaphor in an idiomatic way, without drawing attention to it, and without it carrying any particular significance, in more formal writing, especially that intended for performance, every word is carefully weighed before being committed to paper. Moreover, no matter how shopworn a word or image may be, it is hard to find a genuine cliché in this playwright's work. I submit that the technical aspect of a word or expression would have registered with any careful listener or reader who was also a connoisseur of the Greek language, a category that theoretically could include all Greek speakers in the audience, not just by the occasional "specialist" who happened to be present.[26] Was Aristophanes one of those

[26] *Pace* Pauer, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*, p. 70, who I believe underestimates the sophistication of E.'s audiences.

"specialists"? He seems to have understood Euripides' technical language as just that, technical language. He himself plays directly to the σοφοί among his audience, which he considers the majority, if facetiously (*Ra.* 1109–1118); this is the same audience as would be there for the tragedies. Throughout *Frogs* Aristophanes blithely associates an excessive use of artisanal verbiage to Euripides, and does not hesitate to mimic it himself, with complete confidence that his audience would recognize both the habit and the source of the vocabulary. As Hanna Philipp points out, that Euripides could put into the "mouth of a slave" an expression such as "Doric triglyphs" (*Or.* 1372) with the full expectation of his audience's toleration attests to just how "well-known" (bekannt) and "familiar" (vertraut) this technical language was by the end of the fifth century BC.[27] At any rate we need not posit that all members of Euripides' audience were aware on every occasion of the full range of metatextual implications of the playwright's technically based language, though I assume most of them were, only that he himself was aware of it.[28]

As for the arrangement of the present study, there were several options; I decided upon what I regard as the most straightforward manner of presentation. In the bulk of the book, specifically the first four chapters, I divide the material primarily on the basis of discrete media categories, in order to demonstrate that a broad swath of the visual culture of Euripides' world has, in innumerable ways, found its way into the plays through language and imagery. Additionally Chapters One and Four feature a single play as a kind of leading motif, *Trojan Women* and *Ion*, respectively, though they are by no means the sole focus of these chapters. The fifth chapter, on craftsmanship itself and the creative act, cuts across media. In a study that aims for thoroughness, albeit in a relatively narrow arena, there are yet some things that have had to be left out. First, I have limited my field of evidence for the most part to what we call the fine arts, while acknowledging that many other handicraft activities and productions, less exalted by modern standards, were understood equally by the Greeks

---

[27] Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 44.

[28] In making this assumption, I am encouraged by the following observation by Emily A. McDermott, "Euripides' Second Thoughts," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 130 (2000), 239–259 (241): "If the reader 'buys' the idea that covert significance is couched in an author's words, argumentation is almost unnecessary; if not, elaborate citing of evidence falls on deaf ears. What matters most is the reader's sense of how predisposed a particular author is to engage in word play and metatextual communication to the audience. In Euripides' case, it can be asserted with confidence that he was exceptionally prone to such activity."

as artisinal τέχναι. This is not because these lowlier crafts and their technical language are not well represented in Euripides' plays—they are, and a good deal of this imagery is in fact addressed in Chapter Five—but that to do full justice to them would inordinately extend the length of the book. Poetry and music, as well as medicine, are of course also τέχναι. Obviously, a line had to be drawn somewhere. I chose the fine arts over the more pragmatic crafts because, like poetry itself, at the highest levels their processes and products were considered beautiful and worthy of awe and of aesthetic and intellectual evaluation, yet their ways and means were foreign enough to the poets to render them suitable for metaphor and allusions. Not to mention we have a wealth of preserved examples among which to seek potential sources of inspiration. Another omission is the language of epigraphy, which, in its capacity as a form of writing that is dependent upon the skills of a trained artisan, should occupy a unique position among the τέχναι under consideration in this study. Euripides' familiarity with the various categories of inscriptions and their functions as well as the formulaic language associated with specific types is deducible from his many direct references to inscriptions as well as his habit of mimicking the genre's formal vocabulary and syntax to allude to imaginary inscriptions.[29] However, further exploration of the topic will have to wait for another occasion.

Second, the issue of stage sets is not addressed except peripherally, at which point the relevant bibliography is cited. Although some of the visual aspects of performance introduced in this study might fairly be considered part of the "look" or "spectacle" of the play, little of what Aristotle means by ὄψις (*Po.* 1450a–b), that is, staging, is directly relevant. This is not the place and I am not the person to do justice to the subject. Furthermore, Aeschylus and Sophocles were associated with scenic innovations on the stage, not Euripides.[30] While it is unlikely to appease all of my critics, on matters of staging, I defer to Peter Arnott's recommended *modus operandi*: "We must always look for the simplest answer to any problem, and not the most complicated; we must ask how little was required, and not how much."[31] For those who would indict me

[29] E.g., at *Alc.* 329–330 and *Ph.* 568–577.

[30] Vitr. 7, preface 11 (where A. is said to have put the painter Agatharchus in charge of his sets); Arist. *Po.* 1449a18–19 (where S. is said to have introduced [ἤγαγε] σκηνογραφία). For a skeptical view of the latter, see A.L. Brown, "Three and Scene-Painting Sophocles," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 210 (n. s. 30) (1984), 1–17.

[31] Peter Arnott, *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B. C.* (Oxford, 1962), p. 21.

for dodging a thorny subject, I would respond with a substantive reason for avoiding extensive treatment of problems of stagecraft, the same for why I chose to forego illustrations: My major concern throughout is to demonstrate how language alone is capable of engendering imagery at all levels of poetry and dramaturgy. In the majority of instances the most likely rudimentary representation of the visual environment on the stage is incidental to the interpretative argument. The focus is rather on the relationships between word and image, both poetic and objective, than between image (i.e., what the play looked like in performance) and image.

Third, I do not attempt to address Euripides' plays as the complete, contexualized performances that I full well know them to have been in the fifth century BC. I am sure I do not have to remind readers of this book that Euripides' plays were originally performances and not texts, and to reassure them that, in offering interpretations of individual passages that bear upon the visual arts, I have no intention of claiming these as the primary readings of the lines discussed nor the scenes in which they appear. As for the text *qua* text approach: Until the last thirty years or so, it went unquestioned that classical scholarship was based upon the act of reading. The long-ingrained scholarly habit of treating ancient drama solely as literary text has been forcefully challenged by the work of, for example, Oliver Taplin (*The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* [Oxford, 1877] and *Greek Tragedy in Action* [1978; 2nd ed. London and New York, 2003]), with the result that performance criticism is now established as an important, but not the only, methodological approach to ancient drama. There is a long established tradition of reading Greek plays post-performance, going back to the fifth century itself (*Ra.* 52–54, 1114).[32] (Euripides himself refers to books at *Alc.* 962–969, *Hipp.* 954, and fr. 369. 6.) Audiences of Aristophanic comedy were evidently fully conversant with various idiosyncrasies of the tragedians' language and style and even actual lines, enough to recognize them well after the productions of the plays in which they appeared. Either their memories were superior or they had read and studied texts

[32] For additional evidence for the possession and use of books in the later fifth century, vis à vis the passages in *Ra.*, see Kenneth Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 34–35; Alan H. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford, 1996), ad locc. *Ra.* 52–54, 943, 1114, with further secondary bibliography on reading in ancient Greece; Simon Hornblower, *Thucydides* (Baltimore, MD, 1987), p. 3. In general, see Jesper Svenbro, *Phrasikleia. An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Ithaca and London, 1993).

published in the interim.[33] If the former, then we must assume that audiences listened very, very carefully for nuances of style, allusion, and imagery. If the latter, then we can assume that the plays made the transition to works of written literature before the end of the century. Both, I would argue, justify the "close reading" approach of the present project.

A few essentials: For the reasons mentioned above, and on the advice of the anonymous archaeologist who read my manuscript for Brill, I made the decision to publish without illustrations. Virtually all of the works of art and architecture cited are well-known, the very point behind Euripides' references and allusions to them; for the reader's convenience, easily accessible sources of illustrations are provided in footnotes. In the corpus of Euripides I include both *Rhesus* and the problematic, posthumous *Iphigenia at Aulis*.[34] Unless otherwise noted, I use the latest printed version of James Diggle's three-volume *Oxford Classical Text* edition of Euripides' extant plays, while fragments, again unless otherwise noted, are from Richard Kannicht's *TrGF* 5. References to the scholia of Euripides are to E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem*, 1–2, ad loc. For other ancient authors, unless otherwise noted, I use the standard *OCT* edition. For the fragments of Aeschylus and Sophocles, the text and numbering system of Stefan Radt's *TrGF* 3 and 4, respectively, are adopted. All translations not credited are my own; square brackets are used occasionally to indicate what the Greek does not say but nonetheless implies. In the footnotes I use "cf." in the sense of "compare," for textual evidence, readings, or views that are similar or supporting; there are a lot of these, for it is all too often the case in our field with its long history of scholarship that one encounters one's ideas and interpretations elsewhere after the fact. For the titles of ancient literary works, I use the English version, except in abbreviations. Regarding spellings of ancient proper nouns, I have tried to adhere to the tradition of opting for the most familiar form, whether it is the transliterated Greek or the Latinized version. If this sometimes results in juxtapositions of Greek and Latin spellings in one sentence, I beg the reader's indulgence, as I do for any and all mistakes, whether in point of fact or judgment.

---

[33] Cf. P.T. Stevens, "Euripides and the Athenians," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 76 (1956), 87–94 (93).

[34] For the most recent scholarship on these plays, see A. Feickert, *Euripidis Rhesus. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Studien zur Klassische Philologie) 151 (Frankfurt, 2005); David Kovacs, "Toward a Reconstruction of *Iphigenia Aulidensis*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123 (2003), 77–103; *Euripides*, 6 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2002), pp. 157–163.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for ancient authors and their works follow LSJ, occasionally in a slightly expanded version.

CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, IL, 1968).
CEG	Petrus Allanus Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca. Saeculorum VIII–V A. Chr. N.* (Berlin and New York, 1983).
CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 1–4 (Berlin, 1828–1877).
DK	Hermann Diels and Walther Krantz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed. (Leipzig, 1949–1954).
FGrH	Felix Jacoby, et al., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin and Leiden, 1923–).
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin, 1873–).
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zurich and Munich, 1981–1997).
LSJ	H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H.S. Jones, with R. McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1940).
LSJ *rev. suppl.*	P.G.W. Glare, with A.A. Thompson, *Greek-English Lexicon. Revised Supplement* (Oxford, 1996).
N^1	August Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1856).
N^2	August Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 2nd. ed. (Leipzig, 1889).
NP	Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 16 vols. (Stuttgart and Weimar, 1996–2003).
OCD	Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Oxford and New York, 1996).
Paley^1	F.A. Paley, *Euripides with an English Commentary.* 3 vols. (London, 1857–1860).
Paley^2	F.A. Paley, *Euripides with an English Commentary.* 3 vols. (2nd ed., London, 1872–1880).
PCG	Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin and New York, 1983–).
PEG	Albertus Bernabé, *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum*, 1 (Leipzig, 1987).
PMG	D.L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962).
PMGF	Malcolm Davies, *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1. *Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus* (Oxford, 1991–).

RE	A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encylopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 84 vols. (Stuttgart, 1894–1980).
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.
SIG	Wilhelm Dittenberger, ed., *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*^{3}, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1915–1924).
TLG	*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.
TrGF	Bruno Snell, Richard Kannicht, and Stefan Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 5 vols. (Göttingen, 1971–2004).

CHAPTER ONE

ARCHITECTURE

Introduction

In the prologue to Euripides' *Trojan Women* Poseidon waxes nostalgic about the walls of Troy as their final destruction is underway. His mood of despondence springs in part from a personal connection with the fortifications of his beloved city: He was, as we learn, their architect, along with Apollo (*Tr.* 4–7).[1] Soon enough the audience—and we may include ourselves, both readers and viewers, among them—will soon find ourselves mourning along with the god, for we, too, by the end of what is arguably the saddest drama by "the most tragic of the poets,"[2] will

[1] The ancient references are not consistent on the issue of who built the walls. At *Il.* 21. 446–447 Poseidon takes full credit, whereas at Pi. *O.* 8. 31–32 Poseidon and Apollo share it. In E., at *Andr.* 1010–1015, both gods are cited, as at *Tr.* 4–7, while at *Hel.* 1511, *Or.* 1387–1388, *Rh.* 231–232, and later in *Tr.*, itself, at v. 814, Apollo, alone, is credited. For a recent discussion of the sources, see Guy Hedreen, *Capturing Troy. The Narrative Functions of Landscape in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Art* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2001), pp. 83–87 and 175–176.

[2] Arist. *Po.* 1453a29–30. Modern critics have tended to this conclusion concerning *Tr.* "The whole drama, one may almost say, is a study of sorrow, a study too intense to admit the distraction of plot interest," according to Gilbert Murray, "The 'Trojan Women' of Euripides," *The Living Age* 245 (1905) 37–52 (38); cf. Francis M. Dunn, "Beginning at the End in Euripides' *Trojan Women*," *Rheinisches Museum* 136 (1993), 22–35 (23–24). G.M.A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides* (1941, repr. New York, 1961), pp. 281–282, too, sees sorrow as a structural theme of the play, using an interesting analogy: "This structure consists of an appeal to our emotions on three levels, not unlike a work of sculpture executed in relief on three different planes"; a description of those levels follows. Hélène Perdicoyianni, "Le vocabulaire de la douleur dans L'*Hécube* et les *Troyennes* d'Euripide," *Les Études classiques* 61 (1993), 195–204, through a systematic study of the language of the play, quantifies the pervading sensation of sorrow that has been felt by many. See also N.T. Croally, *Euripidean Polemic: The Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), passim. Whether *Tr.* should still be considered an "anti-war" play, as it has for much of its modern history, is arguable; in the end any work of art that has war as its subject chances being interpreted as a critique of the horrific actions it portrays by the mere nature of those actions. Grube's view (op. cit., p. 280), however, that *Tr.* is "perhaps the finest war-play of all time and certainly Euripides' masterpiece on the subject," is neither dated nor misplaced.

have come to feel the physicality of the doomed city as if it were a real space that we have shared with the actors for the duration of the play. For audiences and critics alike have long sensed that the physical topography of the city of Troy, and especially its slow "demise," provide both a literal and a metaphorical backdrop for the entirety of *Trojan Women*.[3] Indeed, in this play, more than in any other of the many that share its setting, the towering circuit walls that earned Troy its epic fame and continue to serve as a symbol of the ancient city to the present day, function almost like a character that does not speak but whose presence is nonetheless felt from Poseidon's opening words until the final choral utterance.[4] It is as if the walls of the city have their own persona—one entangled with those of the royal family whom they have ultimately failed to protect—which allows the walls to reflect upon the sufferings of the play's human protagonists, and even to undergo suffering in an analogous manner.

The elevation of the physical reality of Troy to a silent, supernumerary presence in *Trojan Women* bears comparison with the way that landscapes, built and otherwise, function in the novels of Thomas Hardy, most conspicuously the landscape of the author's own Dorsetshire, which regularly figures as a provocative force both affecting and reflecting the human tragedies taking place within it.[5] I have in mind Egdon Heath

---

[3] Peter Burian, "Melos or Bust: Reading the *Trojan Women* Historically," *American Philological Association Abstracts* (1999), p. 90, observes that *Tr.* "is the only extant tragedy that actually shows the destruction of a polis, albeit an ancient and barbarian polis." While I encountered it too late to make full use of it in the present study, Stephen Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1990), is clearly a model for this approach.

[4] Of the city's prominence in this play, the remark of P.E. Easterling, "City Settings in Greek Poetry," *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 86 (1989), 5–17 (7), on the Troy of the *Iliad* may be applied equally well to the Troy of *Tr.*: "The really distinctive thing about Troy is that it is important enough to be a major theme, almost a character, in the poem." Eric A. Havelock, "Watching the *Trojan Women*," in *Euripides. A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Erich Segal (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1968), pp. 115–127 (115), notes that, in addition to the two actors playing Poseidon and Hecuba that are on stage as the play opens, "there is a third presence, that of the city of Troy, partly destroyed, smoking, but still standing."

[5] According to Irving Howe, *Thomas Hardy* (New York, 1968), p. 21: "… in all the Wessex novels but *Jude the Obscure*, the natural world figures as a vibrant and autonomous being, in effect a 'character' with its own temperament, force and destiny. Hardy's observation of nature is expert in detail, the reward of a constant and untheoretic exposure; it is often especially powerful for the way he spontaneously transmits to the external world qualities we usually take to be confined to the human." For different purposes, Adrian Poole, "Total Disaster: Euripides' The Trojan Women," *Arion* n. s. 3 (1976), 257–287 (266), also invokes Hardy, in this case, in connection with *Tr.* 1194–1199, Andromache's address to her dead husband's shield, which still bears his "traces"

presiding over *Return of the Native*, where, exactly like Troy in Euripides' play, its landscape is the very first image to be evoked. Think also of Salisbury Plain at the end of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, when Tess and Angel Clare, as they are roaming the plain, suddenly and dramatically find themselves confronted by Stonehenge—a veritable "pavilion of the night," looming ahead with great foreboding. True, with Hardy landscape remains an unfeeling neutral entity that serves to underscore the vulnerability of its human population, whereas Euripides has his Troy identified intimately with its inhabitants even to the point at which it seems to suffer the same fate. (Not to mention that Hardy thought of his tragedies in Aeschylean rather than Euripidean terms.[6]) But the analogy still holds: A physical environment, in Euripides' case, crushed and disgraced, participates in the opening of the story, presides over its events, and closes it, and never in the course of the action fully accedes to the proper role of backdrop. As the most conspicuous visual sign of Troy's onetime power, the doomed walls serve as a kind of psychic structure which iterates and corroborates the escalating desperation of the city's surviving women, the subjects of Euripides' play. Because the city of Troy is inextricably linked with the individual members of the extensive Priamid family, whom Greeks of the Classical period, just as surely as do modern readers, might have felt they knew personally from the vivid, moving portrayals of their lives and characters in the *Iliad* and other epics, Euripides' promotion of the city itself almost to the rank of a character in *Trojan Women* seems a logical step.[7] Troy is thus a kind of avatar for the empathetic Priamid family.

That the topographical landscape of Troy functions as a *dramatis persona* in *Trojan Women* is underscored by the compassionate, deferential manner in which it is treated by the other players. At *Tr.* 1319, τάχ' ἐς φίλαν γᾶν πεσεῖσθ' ἀνώνυμοι ("soon you shall fall on the dear land

---

and upon which now lies her son's small body: "Not for the first time is one reminded of Thomas Hardy, and his deep sensitivity to the sense of absence or lost presence, the faint, vital imprint of humanity on tools, houses, places, memories."

[6] The ending of *Tess* might be cited: "'Justice' was done, and the President of the Immortals, in Aeschylean phrase, had ended his sport with Tess." David Skilton, ed., *Thomas Hardy. Tess of the d'Urbervilles, A Pure Woman* (Middlesex, England and New York, 1978), p. 532, notes that "according to Hardy," the reference is a "literal translation" of μακάρων πρύτανις at *Pr.* 169. I thank Brian Swann for calling this point to my attention.

[7] Cf. Michael J. Anderson, *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford, 1997), p. 27, who treats the theme at length (pp. 27–61): "The fall of Troy is in essence the fall of its ruling family."

nameless"), is sung by the chorus to the built parts of the city, themselves, almost as if they were, like Priam at v. 1313, destroyed, unburied, friendless and, apparently, soon to be forgotten. For, with the destruction of its walls, we are told that the very "name of the land will disappear" (ὄνομα δὲ γᾶς ἀφανὲς εἶσιν, v. 1322). From beginning to end the city is treated as if personified, a situation of which critics have made much. Barlow observes that "Troy itself is almost like one of the Trojan Women, frequently addressed by the women as if it were a person," while M. Dyson and K.H. Lee see the city of Troy as fit for burial in a play in which, with the exception of Astyanax, no other victim of the sack is allowed to be buried properly nor is there time for it: "Astyanax alone will be interred, and the single funeral and burial of the little boy must substitute for all the burials that ought to have been carried out but were not, so as to be almost the very funeral of Troy itself."[8] In reciprocal fashion, according to Dyson and Lee, the fires of the burning city are also the symbolic pyre of Astyanax (the body is actually interred), as he stands for the city and all that has been lost.[9] Of similar mind is Pietro Pucci, commenting on the funerary epigram for Astyanax proposed by Hecuba at *Tr.* 1188–1191: "The poet who writes that inscription is Euripides himself and the sense of the whole play might well be described as his funeral oration inscribed on the tomb of Troy."[10]

Yet something deeper than poetics may be at stake. Regarding what modern literary critics are perhaps too ready to relegate to the neat category, "personification," we should be aware that this deduction may reflect our own outlook rather than the ancient, since we can never fully comprehend what inspired the impulse to regard the world in terms of the component parts and qualities of the human body and its activities, and further, whether the ancient mind would even identify this process as "personification."[11] This tendency, common to many if not most ancient and so-called primitive cultures, possibly reflects an awareness of what constituted reality before the submission of nature to the rationalizing

---

[8] Shirley A. Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women* (1986, repr. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1997), p. 32; M. Dyson and K.H. Lee, "The Funeral of Astyanax in Euripides' *Troades*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 120 (2000), 17–33 (20).

[9] Dyson and Lee, "The Funeral of Astyanax," p. 30.

[10] Pietro Pucci, "Euripides: The Monument and the Sacrifice," rev. vers. in *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Euripides*, ed. Judith Mossman (Oxford, 2003), pp. 139–169 (160).

[11] R.B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate* (Cambridge, Eng., 1951), remains a classic treatment of this vein of ancient thought.

forces of philosophy and the systematic sciences; in short, the impulse to "personify" is older, broader, more complex, and more elemental than the modern literary critical use of the term implies.[12] In this broader spirit, then, Poseidon bids the burning city farewell at vv. 45–47, and the city is apostrophized at vv. 173, 601, 780, 795, 1277–1279, 1323–1324.[13] At v. 403 Cassandra admonishes her mother, Hecuba, not to "pity the land" (οἰκτίρειν … γῆν). At v. 1276 the "suffering" (ταλαίπωρον)[14] city is addressed in most intimate terms, as Hecuba expresses her desire to "embrace" (ἀσπάσωμαι) it in language which comes close to that of Pericles, in the famous funeral oration over the Peloponnesian war dead (Th. 2. 43. 1), urging his fellow Athenians to gaze upon their city and become "lovers" of her. By vv. 1282–1283 Hecuba is ready to immolate herself in the fires and die "together with the burning city" (σὺν τῇδε πατρίδι … πυρουμένῃ), and she encourages the other captives to join her in a death that she considers "most beautiful" (κάλλιστα).[15] As for the final expiration of Troy, the audience is witness to what Priam himself cannot see. That said, the demise of Troy was most likely left to the imagination, much like the violent ends of other characters in Greek tragedy, which almost without exception take place offstage. The mind's eyes and ears are equally conscripted in the generation of imagined sensations evoked by the characters who are left to describe the city's final collapse; at *Tr.* 1325, Hecuba asks ἐμάθετ', ἐκλύετε; ("did you catch it, can you hear?"),[16] and the chorus responds, blankly, in the affirmative: περγάμων ⟨γε⟩ κτύπον ("the thud of the towers").

---

[12] Cf. Kenneth Dover, *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 121–122, on personification from a linguistic standpoint. On personification and related concepts in E., see Wilhelm Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideische Lyrik* (Stuttgart, 1934), pp. 165–172.

[13] Anthony P. Wagener, "Stylistic Qualities of the Apostrophe to Nature as a Dramatic Device," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 62 (1931), 78–100 (80 and passim), emphasizes the emotional nature of the apostrophe as a rhetorical device. Cf. Ajax' addresses to the landscape of Troy at S. *Aj.* 412–417, and again, in his last words before falling on his sword, at 859–863; for discussion, see Oliver Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action* (1978; 2nd ed. London and New York, 2003), pp. 87–88.

[14] Cf. *Tr.* 1324, 1331. At *Or.* 965–966 and *Hel.* 370–374, the land, itself, is actively made to mourn by emulating specific aspects of the ritualistic practices of humans; for non-Euripidean comparanda, see M.L. West, *Euripides Orestes* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1987), p. 250 (ad *Or.* 965).

[15] Cf. Dyson and Lee, "The Funeral of Astyanax," p. 30.

[16] My translation attempts to capture the vivid, disjointed quality of one aorist and one imperfect verb juxtaposed.

While numerous Greek tragedies are set in or around Troy, the degree to which the physicality of the city and especially its walls dominate Euripides' *Trojan Women* has drawn notice. "Troy's rise and fall is synonymous with the presence or absence of her walls," observes Barlow, who treats this topic at some length, weighing both the literal and the symbolic role of the city's fortifications: "Descriptive imagery of place becomes dramatic imagery ... in the *Troades*, where the captured city of Troy is the constant preoccupation of the chorus' thoughts." For Barlow the chorus "bring alive in sensuously evocative language a sense of the city's life, past and present, making the scenes themselves act as commentary."[17] There have been various interpretations of the dramatic rationale for this emphasis. Again, Barlow is attuned to the nuances: "Throughout the choral odes of this play ..., the city of Troy and all its associations are described in such a way as to store emotion cumulatively and make the audience sense the magnitude of its loss."[18] Furthermore, the author continues, the accretion of "brilliant images" throughout the play coalesce to convey the "extraordinary physicality" of the city and result, for the audience, in a persona so intimate that the Greek invasion of the city seems then like a "symbolic and literal rape."[19] Rush Rehm lends support to this notion when he equates πέργαμον, an epic term that occurs frequently in *Trojan Women*, mostly as a proper name for the city of Troy (hence,

[17] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 117 and 28; cf. Barlow, *Trojan Women*, p. 32 and passim, where she identifies "a network of connecting images running through the play," including ships, walls, and fire, which, in addition to their literal role, are also used symbolically and allegorically; in her commentary on *Tr.* 5 she observes (p. 158): "*purgous* is the first reference to the towers or walls which are to feature so strongly in the play, and it is no accident that they are given pointed description here by the word *lainous* 'stone' and the phrase *orthoisin ... kanosin* 'with straight rule'. They are part of the stage-set and symbolize Troy's greatness, they are the scene of Astyanax' death, and they collapse at the end of the play."

[18] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 32; cf. Dyson and Lee, "The funeral of Astynax," p. 27, who see the death of Astyanax as "symbolizing the end of a way of life of an entire community."

[19] Barlow, *Trojan Women*, p. 35 (see also p. 32): "They [the chorus] somehow manage to create, through a series of brilliant images, the extraordinary physicality and intimacy of that place [i.e., Troy]—its houses, its acropolis, its gates, its temples, its beaches, its altars, its graven images. The Greek invasion of it, which involves both symbolic and literal rape, is likewise purveyed through tangible and visual pictures ..." Cf. Elizabeth Craik, "Sexual Imagery and Innuendo in *Troades*," in *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*, ed. Anton Powell (London and New York, 1990), pp. 1–15 (4 and passim): "There is throughout the play an almost schematic opposition between women with city (houses, gates, buildings of Troy) outraged on the one hand and men with ships (oars, spears, torches) attacking on the other."

its capitalization in some texts), both with fortification towers (πύργοι) and with marriage (γάμος), two themes which haunt the play.[20] From the point of view of historical precedent, the device of maintaining audience focus on the city by constantly iterating its physical aspects is Homeric in inspiration, if less formulaic. N.T. Croally, noting how, in the play, "the remains of the city of Troy dominate our sense of scene, [and] the remnants of the past overshadow the proceedings," attributes the emphasis on the walls in *Trojan Women* to epic antecedents.[21] P.E. Easterling also connects the use of the walls with epic: "However we interpret *Trojan Women* we have to recognize the enormous power of the city image, specifically Troy with all its Iliadic features recalled in detail, though set in a perspective of modern and often cynical dialectic."[22]

Still, in commentaries on the play and important critical studies such as those mentioned above, the pervasiveness of Troy as image and as idea has been sensed and asserted but not followed up with a methodical documentation throughout the play of the evidence provided by Euripides' language, collected and analyzed from both the philological and archaeological perspectives to which it naturally lends itself. In other words, the extent to which Poseidon's introduction of the image of Troy's walls in the prologue of *Trojan Women* is a preview of a profusion of architecturally inflected language in the form of themes, references, allusions, figures of speech and metaphors,[23] has not been fully analyzed. By turning the

---

[20] Rush Rehm, *Marriage to Death. The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton, 1994), p. 210, n. 10; see below for a list of occurrences.

[21] Croally, *Euripidean Polemic*, pp. 163–206; quotation, p. 198.

[22] Easterling, "City Settings," p. 16. John Davidson, "Homer and Euripides' *Troades*," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 45 (2001), 65–79 begins with the premise that E. on the whole relies less on Homer than do both A. and S., which seems questionable, at best; however, he goes on to argue convincingly for numerous Homeric parallels in *Tr.*, both in language and in theme, concluding: "while we can still validly say that in the *Troades* Euripides is setting off the epic past against the tragic present, he is at the same time offering an impassioned Homeric footnote, no, let us say an impassioned Homeric sequel, to the *Iliad* itself." Davidson addresses the issue of the walls only very briefly (op. cit., p. 71).

[23] I use the words "metaphor" and "metaphorical" throughout this study with some trepidation, aware of the inevitable hazards of forming deductions about ancient language from a modern perspective. I hope, however, that I have not used the designation too liberally, applying it where perhaps it does not pertain. On the dangers of labeling certain usages of language in E. metaphorical, I am fully aware of the validity of such cautionary sentiments as those of Dover, *Greek Prose Style*, p. 122, even if I may be judged as not having heeded them in every instance: "Identifying metaphors in the language of one's own time, nation, class, and culture is not difficult, thanks to the vast linguistic store which we carry within us. Identifying them in a past language is a very different matter,

audience's attention immediately to the physical aspect of Troy's walls, the god prepares us for the overriding, emotionally oppressive, role of those walls and other features of Troy's cityscape in the drama that is to follow. His words prepare us, as well, for the expressive potential of foregrounding an enduring symbol of the ephemeral nature of built structures, that is, walls, and, ultimately, of the vanity of power and prestige and the human beings that create, enjoy, and relinquish them with predictable regularity. In the following pages we shall see how this is accomplished solely through language.

For a play that accords such prominence to its topographical setting, it is fair to ask: What was seen on stage? In itself the setting of *Trojan Women* is not, of course, unique in Greek drama; the settings of many, if not most, Greek tragedies feature architecture of some form or another, although there is little certainly about how, or even if, that architecture was represented on stage.[24] In the case of *Trojan Women*, while there is

---

because the available evidence is exiguous in the extreme compared with what we need for statistical justification of our identification." For more extensive consideration of the definitions and application of specific categories of imagery, including metaphor, to E., the reader is referred to Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 35–94.

[24] The opening settings of Euripides' extant tragedies, other than *Tr.*: *Alc.* (palace of Admetus at Pherae); *Med.* (Medea's house in Corinth); *Heracl.* (temple of Zeus Agoraios at Marathon); *Hipp.* (palace of Theseus at Trozen); *Andr.* (Neoptolemos' house in Thessaly); *Hec.* (Agamemnon's tent in the Greek encampment on the coast of Thrace); *Supp.* (temple of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis); *El.* (house of Electra and her husband); *HF* (house of Heracles at Thebes); *IT* (temple of Artemis at Tauris); *Ion* (temple of Apollo at Delphi); *Hel.* (palace of Theoclymenos in Egypt); *Ph.* (royal palace at Thebes); *Or.* (royal palace at Argos); *Ba.* (palace of Pentheus at Thebes); *IA* (Agamemnon's tent at Aulis); *Rh.* (Hector's tent at Troy). The opening settings of the extant plays of Aeschylus: *Supp.* (a shrine on the coast near Argos); *Pr.* (a remote rocky landscape in Scythia); *Pers.* (royal council hall at Susa); *Th.* (acropolis of Thebes); *Ag.* (royal palace at Argos); *Ch.* (tomb of Agamemnon at Argos); *Eum.* (temple of Apollo at Delphi). The opening settings of the extant plays of Sophocles: *Aj.* (Ajax's hut at Troy); *El.* (royal palace at Mycenae); *OT* (royal palace at Thebes); *Ant.* (royal palace at Thebes); *Tr.* (house in Trachis where Heracles is living in exile); *Ph.* (the uninhabited island of Lemnos); *OC* (the sacred grove of the Eumenides at Colonus). For a convenient summary analysis of the settings of ancient plays, including comedies, see J. Michael Walton, *Greek Theatre Practice* (London, 1991), pp. 129–131, who detects in tragedy as the fifth-century progressed "a move toward a type of realism, with emphasis shifting away from Aeschylus' drama of the imagination." This premise accords well with the above evidence, which suggests that A. and S. preferred natural or at least rural settings to built environments, while, as Walton, op. cit., p. 130, also notes, "Euripides sets most of his plays before some kind of building." Nicolaos C. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides. Form and Function of the Scenic Space* (Athens, 1965), p. 9, goes further: "In all the extant plays of Euripides the action takes place before some sort of building or dwelling-place;" see his discussion, pp. 9–13, with a complete list of the settings of plays and fragmentary plays on p. 11.

disagreement as to what, if anything, of the architecture of Troy was featured, general consensus is that the walls and some other topographical features were at least rudimentarily represented. Barlow, for instance, assumes that the walls are represented onstage, although she is not forthcoming about when and how they appear.[25] Arnott is more specific, seeing the *skene* at the beginning of the play as representing the captives' huts and, in a position that has not found general acceptance, postulating a change of sets at the end, when Talthybius enters "with his party of incendiaries" and the walls of Troy must then have been shown; however, noting the rarity of such a change leads Arnott to conclude that neither of these sets can have been very realistically rendered.[26] Most convincing is Lee, who disagrees with Arnott's suggestion of a change of sets, positing instead that the fire "is to be imagined ... as burning not on the stage, but in the background, i.e. ἐν κορυφαῖς Ἰλιάσιν," a reference to *Tr.* 1256. Lee characterizes the scene at the opening of the play thus: "The stage-building represents one of the tents in which the Trojan women are dwelling temporarily as they await the names of their masters and their subsequent departure for Greece. ... We are to imagine in the background the walls of Troy and the buildings of the city, from which smoke is rising."[27] This seems sensible, since it will be remembered that

---

[25] Barlow, *Trojan Women*, p. 158 (ad loc. *Tr.* 5), quoted in note 17, above; cf. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 117: "The fact that they [i.e., the battlements] are part of the stage set, that they are the physical embodiment of the Trojan community and that the are the object both of Astyanax' execution and the Greek demolition squads, makes it appropriate that their importance is brought out in descriptive passages." Barlow, *Trojan Women*, p. 157, adds that, at the opening of the play, "the audience would see makeshift tents belonging to the Greeks;" she does not discuss the staging of the burning of the city. Cf. Havelock, "Watching the *Trojan Women*," p. 115: "Behind the prostrate woman [i.e., Hecuba] we see the city gates and in the foreground to either side the tents and huts of the Greek army ...".

[26] Arnott, *Greek Scenic Conventions*, p. 100, noting: "This freedom is unusual in Euripides, and harks back to the Aeschylean treatment of the stage, but shows clearly enough that no realistic hut structures were built." Against a change of sets is Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, pp. 24–25, 123, who sees no need to stage the burning of Troy when the audience's imagination has been stoked with its visual details all along (see also n. 27, below); cf. Craik, "Sexual Imagery," p. 4, with n. 6, who offers a plausible outline of the sets and stage action for the entire play, and, more extensively, Michael R. Halleran, *Stagecraft in Euripides* (Totowa, NJ, 1985), pp. 92–102.

[27] K.H. Lee, *Euripides Troades* (1976; repr. London, 1997), pp. 274 and 65; I am assuming that by "imagine," here, Lee means that an actual audience was meant to do the imagining, although his meaning is somewhat ambiguous, as is David Kovacs, *Euripides* 4 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1999), p. 13, who seems to be saying the same thing: "The *skene* represents the tent in which the Trojan captives are housed. In the background is to be imagined the city of Troy, now a smoking ruin. Eisodos A leads to the Greek

Poseidon refers to the city as already burning in the prologue, and a burning city would be hard to sustain in stage imagery for the length of the play, unless the imagination were enlisted.

But these are questions that admit no definitive answers.[28] This being drama, in one way or another, it fell to the performers, through the uniquely expressive vehicle of Euripides' language, to bear the greater share of the burden of registering the tragic gravity of the city's annihilation, alongside which any attempt at scenic representation would seem inadequate and superfluous. Precisely for this reason I submit that descriptive, and suggestively descriptive language served in part to fill whatever gaps there may have been in the scenery, toward the enhancement of ὄψις in *Trojan Women*. In the end the appearance of architectural props and their efficacy does not substantially affect the premise of the present study that, in this play, as elsewhere in Euripides, language, alone, based upon, or inspired by, the actual working vocabulary of the building arts, is capable of conveying all that is visually relevant to the unfolding events and the actors' responses to them.

What follows, however, is no mere catalogue of architectural references and explanations of the meanings of often specialized lexical items, but rather a slow unveiling of a parallel universe, as it were, of intertextual imagery that is spun out in tandem with the action of *Trojan Women*, what I will henceforth refer to as "architectural language." We shall see how, throughout the play, the walls loom large both as a reminder of the particular spatial locale in which the unfolding tragedy takes place and as a haunting notional presence, imposing themselves explicitly on the action of the play as well as implicitly by inspiring many of Euripides' most effective artisanal-based figures of speech. It has often been

---

ships, Eisodos B to the city of Troy." Closest in spirit to my approach to the scenery of *Tr.* is the argument of Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination.* pp. 122–123 (which I encountered only very late in the development of this chapter), who similarly emphasizes the role of the imaginary recreation of the city in the minds of the audience members over and above the actual sets: "What the audience actually see represented on stage are the military huts in which the Trojan captives are kept; what they have to imagine as extending immediately beyond this visible area is the rest of the Greek camp … But the real scenery of the play is the 'city of Troy', now burnt to ashes, a tragic image of desolation, smouldering ruins and wailing, which is transmitted to the spectator right from the beginning." Hourmouziades, however, does not attempt to document how this done through any but the most topographically descriptive passages; his concerns lie elsewhere.

[28] Cf. Werner Biehl, *Euripides Troades* (Heidelberg, 1989), pp. 449–450, commenting on the firing of Troy at *Tr.* 1295 ff.

claimed that *Trojan Women*, for all of its pathos, lacks a unifying principle, that what passes for a plot is but a series of unconnected episodes, that its structure is "un-Aristotelian in the extreme."[29] I shall argue that the physical destruction of Troy is one unifying theme. The steady stream of architecturally inflected language in *Trojan Women* is not directed solely toward the enhancement of the audience's sensation of visual reality; Aristotle (*Po.* 1450a–b), after all, holds ὄψις to be the least important of his six conditions of tragic performance. On the contrary architectural language in *Trojan Women* represents much more than a literary mechanism whereby, absent the scenic resources of a modern-day opera stage, an audience might conjure up before its eyes an image of the falling city, as well as it succeeds in this essential, if secondary, task. This language also contributes to, and prepares the audience for, the final, devastating tragedy. Even more importantly it attests to the colossal scope of the quality of life that is being drained from Troy in its final moments, as well as an agency whereby to manipulate the "fear and pity" (*Po.* 1449b) of an audience's response.

As we trace the path of architecturally inflected language in *Trojan Women*, we will also explore how Euripides' preoccupation with architecture and its language, while exceptional in its high degree of concentration in this particular play, is not an isolated occurrence, but rather reflects a broader interest in the art and craft of building which can be documented in the language of his other extant plays and fragments, as well. We shall see that his playwright's trademark fondness for the minute details of daily life reveals itself in characterizations of such standard features of the ancient architectural landscape as altars, statue bases, houses,

[29] Dunn, "Beginning at the End," pp. 22–24, with further references; quotation, p. 22; see also, e.g., the summary of the problem in Thomas J. Sienkewicz, "Euripides' *Trojan Women*: An Interpretation," *Helios* 6 (1978), 81–95 (81–83). For those of such a mindset, the play has frequently been supplied with the *raison d'être* of a response to current historical developments, including the massacre at Melos of 416 and the expedition to Sicily of 415–413, making *Tr.*, for all intents and purposes, into a political statement; for a refutation of the view that, with or without the Melos connection, *Tr.* is a political play, see David Kovacs, "Gods and Men in Euripides' Trojan Trilogy," *Colby Quarterly* 33 (1997), 162–176, with references to the relevant earlier literature pro and con; for attempts to resuscitate the view, see, recently, Burian's abstract, "Melos or Bust," and Joseph Roisman, "Contemporary Allusions in Euripides' *Trojan Women*," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1997), 38–47, who suggests that it is the Spartans of the Peloponnesian war who are to be associated with the poor behavior on display by Greeks in the play. In this study, while I do suggest possible connections with contemporary monuments and circumstances, I am more in sympathy with the views of Kovacs et al. that the play's major themes are larger and less overtly topical.

palaces, temples, and of course, walls, which, in his hands, present multiple opportunities to deploy a broad and well-informed architectural vocabulary with remarkable technical sophistication. We shall see how Euripides' evident acquaintance with language associated with the technical aspects of construction provides him with a ready vocabulary for vivid images, metaphors, and other poetic figures. Finally, we shall discover that, in a twist, the language turns out to be more prosaic than poetic, as it is more often paralleled in building inscriptions and in lexigraphical, grammatical, and other technical contexts than in the expected places, the works of historians, philosophers, and fellow poets.

The Topography of the City

Building and destruction, yoked together by the circumstance of the demolition of the built environment that provides the physical setting of the play, are the twin architectural themes of *Trojan Women*, and its language consistently reflects and embodies those themes. To begin to calculate how architectural language insinuates itself into the action of this play by its sheer profusion alone, a summary of the references to architecture in this play is useful. On the broadest level, but not to be overlooked, the city of Troy as an entity, mostly a sacked one, is referred to or alluded to some fifty-six times.[30] The circuit walls alone, including the towers and gates, are mentioned or alluded to some twenty-three times, to which may be added the mention of the Cyclopean walls of Argos which are cited as still reaching for the sky, unlike the walls of

[30] *Tr.* 7–9, 45–47, 59–60, 95–96 (a general reference to the sacking of "cities, temples and tombs"), 145, 173 (where the city is addressed), 365, 401, 403, 461, 484, 556, 582, 585–586, 596, 601 (where the fatherland is addressed), 603, 704–705, 730, 773, 780 and 795 (where the city is addressed), 806–807, 814–815, 816 (all referring to an earlier sack of Troy by Telemon and Heracles), 817–818 (referring to both the earlier and the present sacks), 825, 850–851, 892–893 (where Helen is said to sack cities and burn houses), 994, 1065, 1079–1080, 1160–1161 (a reference to the possibility of Troy's being rebuilt [ὀρθώσειεν] by Astyanax), 1164, 1168, 1186 (ἄπολις as an epithet for Hecuba), 1217, 1261, 1263 (where a favorite Euripidean verb, κατασκάπτω, following W.R. Connor, "The Razing of the House in Greek Society," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115 [1985], 79–102 [97], though not in reference to this passage, could serve to "emphasize the severity of the destruction … [or] hint that there was a religious pretext or justification for the act"), 1271, 1274 (twice), 1276 (where the burning city is personified, Hecuba desiring to "embrace" [ἀσπάσωμαι] it), 1277–1279 (where the city is addressed), 1283, 1291–1292 (three times), 1297, 1311, 1317, 1319 (where the city's built parts are addressed), 1324, 1325, 1326, 1331.

Troy, whose presence is thereby invoked indirectly.[31] Noteworthy in this context is the unusually high concentration of appearances (six) of the word πέργαμος, which must be considered an allusion to the circuit walls.[32] In this play, as elsewhere in Greek literature, the term functions both as a proper noun for the city of Troy (as at Hdt. 7. 43) and as a generic reference to any towering citadel, perhaps itself the impetus for the proper name. The unmistakable consonance with the word for towers (πύργοι) is hard to ignore. This, along with the word's sole metaphorical occurrence at Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* 956 (δοκεῖτε δὴ / ναίειν ἀπενθῆ πέργαμ' ["you seem to inhabit heights that are free from grief"] said by Prometheus of Hermes), would seem to confirm this etymology.[33] Since the primary characteristic of a citadel is its fortification walls and towers, and Troy's walls were regarded as the most emblematic of the genre, with the use of πέργαμος in *Trojan Women*, the walls may be seen to be serving yet again as a synecdoche for the city. Moreover, the fact that, with the exception of *Tr.* 1065, the word always appears in the plural lends further support to the possibility that it is meant to allude to the walls.

Other architectural or topographical features of the city's landscape mentioned or alluded to, often several times, include: the temples and precincts of the gods as a whole;[34] Athena's temple;[35] Apollo's

---

[31] Walls and/or towers: *Tr.* 4–6, 12, 46, 118, 612, 725, 783–784, 814–815, 817, 844, 956 (twice), 967, 1011, 1121, 1134, 1174 (walls), 1174 (towers), 1297. Croally, *Euripidean Polemic*, pp. 192–193, has a similar, but partial list; cf. the list in Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 101. Gates: 37, 521, 532, 1089. Cyclopean walls of Argos, 1087–1088.

[32] *Tr.* 556, 598, 851, 1065, 1295, 1325. The term is Iliadic (*Il.* 4. 508; 5. 446, 460; 6. 512; 7. 21; 24. 700), where it refers specifically to the area of the Trojan citadel where Apollo's temple was built and the god resided, but otherwise occurs nowhere else with such frequency. E.'s own problematic *IA* may contain four occurrences (589 [obelized by Diggle], 762, 773 [bracketed by Kovacs, *Euripides* 4], 1576), and it makes an occasional appearance sporadically across the Euripidean corpus, the great majority in reference to Troy. In S. πέργαμος is found four times, all in *Ph.* (347, 353, 611, 1334), in reference to Troy; its single appearance in A. is with metaphorical sense at *Pr.* 956. Pindar uses the term at *O.* 8. 42, *I.* 6. 31, *Pae.* 6. 96, all of Troy.

[33] While the controversy over the authorship of *Pr.* continues, I follow C.J. Herington, *The Author of the Prometheus Bound* (Austin, TX, and London, 1970) that it is a work of Aeschylus.

[34] *Tr.* 15, 86 (through inference), 1317.

[35] *Tr.* 69, 85, 526. Verses 539–541 on the dragging of the Trojan horse to the sanctuary of Athena are difficult both to construe and to interpret; Robert Y. Tyrrell, *The Troades of Euripides* (London, 1901), p. 82, is somewhat ambiguous in suggesting that the horse was deposited "in the shrine" and "on the floor," while Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 170, believes that it was brought right into the temple. The key phrase, εἰς ἕδρανα / λάϊνα δάπεδά τε, would appear to locate the final placement of the horse inside, on the stone

temple;[36] Zeus' temple;[37] the altar of Zeus Herkeios, where Priam was slain;[38] Priam's and Hecuba's house;[39] Paris' house;[40] Hector's and Andromache's house;[41] the house of Deiphobus, Helen's second Trojan husband;[42] the houses of the other Trojans;[43] Hector's tomb;[44] the tombs of Hecuba's other children;[45] and the acropolis.[46] That "acropolis" is not necessarily a synonym for citadel, but refers to a distinct area with the city proper, is supported archaeologically by the cases of both Athens and Mycenae, each of which has an acropolis within its city walls.[47] To this list might also be added: an indirect reference, by way of her cult statue, to the temple of Athena;[48] Athena's mention of an "outrage" committed

---

pavement. As difficult as that scenario is to imagine logistically, perhaps we should accept it as a proper occasion for the use of poetic license in order to make clear just how huge was the final outrage that the "gift" of the horse represented. There is also the possibility that the unusual metaphors of a ship being hauled into the temple of Athena used of the Trojan horse at *Tr.* 537–541 and of the horse as a "four-footed [i.e., wheeled] wagon" at *Tr.* 516 may have served as oblique reminders to the audience of that unwieldy vessel, the Panathenaic ship-cart that was used to convey the new peplos—also a gift for Athena (cf. *Tr.* 536, χάριν)—hoisted as its sail in the Panathenaic procession, the probable subject of the Parthenon frieze. Cf. Paley[2] 2, p. 507, citing Christopher Wordsworth, *Athens and Attica: Journal of a Residence There* (London, 1836), p. 154. That the ship-cart is conspicuously absent from the Parthenon frieze has often been noted; however, there remains a possibility that it was represented in paint rather than in relief.

[36] *Tr.* 256–258, 329–330, although there are problems associated with the former. Its precise interpretation depends on a reading of κλάδας ('branches') or κλῇδας ('keys') in 256. Diggle, following a suggestion by J. Stanley, prints the former while Murray prints the latter, following the manuscript tradition. For both sides of the issue, see Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 117, who concludes that "Hecuba is referring to the keys of the temple of Apollo which Cassandra carried with her and which were, therefore, the symbols of her sacred office." Whichever the reading, it is clear that the passage alludes in some way to the rites performed in Apollo's honor at or around his temple. If "keys" is correct, then the passage constitutes a direct reference to the physical building.

[37] *Tr.* 1060–1061, 1074 (the statue/s in Zeus' temple or its precinct).

[38] *Tr.* 16–17, 481, 1061–1062.

[39] *Tr.* 141, 399 (either Priam's or Paris' house; for the latter, Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 141), 1215 (the house of Priam as an entity), 1321.

[40] *Tr.* 954; 1020.

[41] *Tr.* 602, 646, 650, 651, 746, 1172.

[42] *Tr.* 963, although Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 234, believes that τὰ οἴκοθεν κεῖνα refers to the entire length of Helen's stay in Troy, not just to her relatively brief sojourn in the house of Deiphobus.

[43] *Tr.* 154, 157, 166, 388, 528, 548, 553, 607, 841, 1296, 1300.

[44] *Tr.* 1132–1133.

[45] *Tr.* 480.

[46] *Tr.* 556–557, 1256; the "rock" at 523 is perhaps also a reference to the acropolis.

[47] Cf. Lee, *Euripides Troades*, pp. 172–173: "The acropolis contained not only all the temples of the gods, but also the palaces of Priam and his sons, Hector and Paris."

[48] *Tr.* 599; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 180.

at her temple, to which Poseidon responds in recognition of Ajax having there raped Cassandra, who sought refuge at Athena's statue;[49] as well as a reference to the deaths of Trojans around altars, and perhaps more specifically, to the death of Priam.[50] Additionally, there are the city's newest landmarks: Achilles' tomb;[51] Agamemnon's tents;[52] and the temporary holding quarters for the seized Trojan women and Helen.[53] The tomb composed of "stone walls" (περιβόλων … λαΐνων, v. 1141) that Astyanax will not be buried in, at Andromache's request, could allude to one or the other of the two most prominent royal burial structures used in the late Bronze age, the shaft grave (in reference to the walls of the shaft itself or the enclosure wall of the precinct, as at Mycenae) or the later beehive or tholos.[54] Thus, by the end of the play, much of the cityscape will have been summoned to mind; the audience will feel that it knows this city well, a poignant realization in light of the fact that all of these structures are now nearly or completely in ruins. The "character" of the city has taken some elaborating in order that it may be rendered "sympathetic."

Hypothetical speculations about the urban topography of the Trojan women's future homes in Greece also play a significant role in the events, while at the same time lending a further architectural emphasis to the proceedings. Hecuba imagines herself a porter at the doors, she who had once been queen and mother of the great Hector.[55] Cassandra alludes ominously on a number of occasions to the House of Agamemnon;[56] she also speaks of the house of Odysseus[57] and other Greek houses[58] multiple times, as if she knows them well. The house of Neoptolemus, for which Andromache is destined, is mentioned[59] and alluded to by way

[49] *Tr.* 69.

[50] *Tr.* 562; for the last, see Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 173.

[51] *Tr.* 39, 264, 265, 622–623.

[52] *Tr.* 139.

[53] Alluded to at 299 (μυχούς), mentioned at 871, 880, 897.

[54] Admittedly, the expression could as easily reflect acquaintance with a contemporary trend in burial practices, as described by S.C. Humphreys, "Family Tomb and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980), 96–126 (111, with references in n. 31): "Towards the latter part of the fifth century, we also find the beginning of the practice of surrounding groups of graves with a stone peribolos, which was to lead to the monumental family tomb-enclosures of the fourth century."

[55] *Tr.* 194 and 492–493.

[56] *Tr.* 359–360, 364, 365–366, 371, 461.

[57] *Tr.* 427–428, 1311.

[58] *Tr.* 379, 380.

[59] *Tr.* 660.

of its hearth[60] and its bridal chamber.[61] Menelaus' house is invoked some ten times.[62] Greek topography also includes the temple of Athena of the Brazen House in Sparta;[63] the walls and the gates of Argos;[64] the "gates" of the isthmus of Corinth;[65] and Phthian temples.[66] Finally, Greece itself is alluded to by way of an architectural figure of speech ("high-towered fatherland").[67] While every one of these references need not necessarily be expected to have summoned up a mental image of a real building before the eyes of the spectator, it seems likely that actual buildings rather than abstract images are being invoked, since a physical change of homeland is indeed in store for the captive women.

Walls

Why walls? Troy may be the most famous, primarily because of Homer, but it is by no means the only Bronze age city to be and to have been epitomized by its walls, as both the epithets for, and the archaeological remains of, ἐϋκτίμενος ("well-built") Homeric Mycenae and τειχιόεις ("high-walled") Tiryns, to cite only the two most impressive examples, well attest.[68] At *Tr.* 1087–1088 the mention of Argos' Cyclopean walls alone is sufficient to evoke the glory of that Bronze age city, in a manner all the more poignant in light of the fact that another great city currently

60 *Tr.* 1138.

61 *Tr.* 1139.

62 *Tr.* 865–866, 939, 943, 946, 947, 984, 996–997, 1033, 1037, 1111.

63 *Tr.* 1113; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 254. Cf. Paus. 3. 17. 2–4; Th. 1. 128.

64 *Tr.* 1087–1088, 1089.

65 *Tr.* 1099; on the use of the word πύλας, Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 252, remarks that "the Corinthian isthmus can be regarded as the gateway to the Peloponnesus and it was in fact often walled in time of war." Craik, "Sexual Imagery," pp. 10–11, sees the image differently: "The geographical allusions are not randomly chosen, but are pointed, with strong sexual implications." She continues: "The chorus seem to be speculating about regions of Greece; but in reality are brooding on the sexual fate they will meet there."

66 *Tr.* 575–576.

67 *Tr.* 376.

68 Easterling, "City Settings," p. 7, observes of the characterization of Troy in the *Iliad*: "It does not seem unfair to conclude that Troy, though rich and special, is not in a quite different league from Argos, Mycenae or Corinth; for a real contrast we ought to be looking to Egyptian Thebes with its hundred gates ([*Il.*] 9. 381–384)." On the significance of walls for Troy and for ancient cities in general, see Croally, *Euripidean Polemic*, pp. 167–168. Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City*, pp. 145–157, provides a useful overview of the ideological role of walls in the civilizations of the Ancient Near East.

lies in ruins.[69] At *Cyc.* 115 Odysseus asks of Etna: "But where are the walls and towers of the city?" (τείχη δὲ ποῦ 'στι καὶ πόλεως πυργώματα;), as if to say: "Where are the most obvious signs of civilization?". Silenus' answer, that there are none, since these parts are "empty of humans" (ἔρημοι ... ἀνθρώπων, v. 116), leads Odysseus to conclude that the inhabitants of such a place must be wild animals. (He is almost correct, Silenus responds, since the Cyclopes live in caves, not roofed houses.) As for Troy, it may be in an effort to retain the image of a soldier's worm's-eye view of dauntingly high citadel walls generated by the curious Homeric expression, ὑπ' Ἴλιον ("under Troy"), that Euripides adopts it for the only time in tragedy at *Or.* 648; others use the more simply locative ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ ("at Troy"), which bypasses the image altogether.[70]

At *Hec.* 1209–1210 Troy's previous state of good fortune is summarized by three things: its intact fortification walls (πύργος), Priam's occupation of the throne, and Hector's active spear. Things were not all that much different in 415 BC, the date of *Trojan Women*'s production, when many Greek cities, including Athens, were famed for, and dependent upon, their fortification walls.[71] Those of Athens, itself—the Themistoclean walls, the long walls, the Piraeus wall—would have been familiar and reassuring landmarks in the city of the Peloponnesian war. The memory of the construction of the Themistoclean walls directly after the Persian wars, an event noteworthy for its rapidity and for its incorporation of blocks which had previously been used for sculpture (Th. 1. 93. 2), might still have been fresh in the minds of those few Athenians who had lived through it and certainly visible to those who did not.[72] The

[69] Whether νέμονται is taken as passive or middle (Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 251), it is clear that the walls are standing for the city.

[70] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 188, with comparanda, who does not, however, make the association with the image of the walls that I propose here.

[71] John McK. Camp II, "Walls and the *Polis*," in *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, eds. Pernille Flensted-Jensen, Thomas Heine Nielsen, and Lene Rubinstein (Copenhagen, 2000), pp. 41–57 (50), argues that, in Greece, city walls stop being built "in the mid-second century BC with the serious arrival of Rome," and do not pick up again "until the breakdown of security in the third century AD, when we find new circuits at Athens, Olympia, Dion, Aigina, and elsewhere." Camp attributes the lacuna to "official Roman policy," which he then discusses.

[72] Rehm, *Marriage to Death*, p. 135, with n. 18, sees a direct connection between the sacks of the acropolis by the Persians in 480/79 BC and the final sack of Troy in E.'s *Tr.*, and points out that, in the play, the Greeks are guilty of the trademark hubris of the Persians. For a recent review and new interpretation of the evidence for

construction of the long walls to Athens' ports of Piraeus and Phaleron towards the middle of the fifth century and a third wall parallel to the original Piraeus wall several years later fall somewhat closer in time to *Trojan Women*.[73] The last are likely to have received renewed attention during the Peloponnesian war and would end destroyed by the Spartans in 404. There is an additional irony to this, since the Spartans, after the Persian defeat, had advised the Athenians *not* to rebuild their fortification walls and had suggested, furthermore, that the Athenians join them in tearing down the fortifications of all cities outside the Peloponnesus (Th. 1, 90).[74]

In the Classical period walls were central to Athenian life and government, so central that, eventually, they become nearly synonymous with the treasured Athenian notion of αὐτάρκεια ("self-sufficiency") and of the democracy itself.[75] Fortification walls were functional devices, to be sure, but also constant visual reminders of a city's strength, a symbolic role that was no less integral to the well-being of its inhabitants. Not incidentally Athens' walls provided the requisite security to facilitate the crowning glory of Periclean Athens, the building program on the acropolis, the presumptive locus for that beauty which, if contemplated with sufficient rapture, would inspire its citizens to become proud defenders

---

the Themistoclean wall, see Balbina Bäbler, "Die archaischen attischen Grabstelen in der themistokleischen Stadtmauer: Grabschändung oder Apotropaion?," *Philologus* 145 (2001), 3–15.

[73] For the dates, see R.E. Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens* (Princeton, 1978), pp. 15–16. All three sets of walls are alluded to at Pl. *Grg.* 455e, where Gorgias (whose visit to Athens in 427 is usually taken as the occasion for the dialogue) and Socrates recall Themistocles' role in advising Athenians on the earlier fortifications, and, in a speech that Socrates claims to have heard himself, Pericles' recommending the construction of the "middle" (μέσου) wall, which E.R. Dodds, *Plato Gorgias* (Oxford, 1959), p. 210, associates with this last wall and suggests a possible date of 444–442 BC, "when Socrates was 25 and could well have heard Pericles' speech about it"; on the historical logistics of this exchange, with further references, see Dodds, loc. cit.

[74] I owe this observation to John Walsh, who also pointed out (cf. *OCD*, s. v. "The Long Walls") that it could be significant that Thucydides' discussion of wall-building in the "Pentacontaetia" is one of the very few examples of his discussion of internal developments in Athens during the period; on the importance of walls in Thucydides' "Archaeology" and to the history, in general, see Tim Rood, *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford, 1998) p. 231, with n. 18. For our purposes, it is enough to conclude that Thucydides, a contemporary of E.'s, reflects the sentiments of the day concerning walls.

[75] On this, see further Croally, *Euripidean Polemic*, p. 169; Josiah Ober, "Hoplites and Obstacles," in *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, ed. Victor Davis Hanson (London and New York, 1991), pp. 173–196 (180).

of their city and the ideology it represented, as Pericles' exhortation in the funeral oration attributed to him implies. Thus, in exploiting the inherent drama of the razing of walls, Euripides can be seen, in one sense, to be capitalizing on the resonance such a motif might be expected to have among an Athenian audience of the second half of the fifth century BC.[76]

Since walls were an imperative of existence in a very real way in ancient cities, it is not surprising that they were tapped for their symbolic value in literature from an early date. Accordingly, a city's relative strength or weakness comes to be defined by its walls in more than a literal sense and the extinction of a city's "spirit" is conflated with the destruction of the built things in which it is materialized. Alongside this, there was, by the time Euripides wrote, a long-standing tradition of culling architecture's plentiful vocabulary for metaphors for both human strength and human frailty (walls and towers fall, after all) in a more abstract, oblique way.[77] The *Iliad*, especially, is full of such references. Ajax is a ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν ("wall of the Achaeans") at *Il.* 3. 229, 6. 5; 7. 211; similarly, the suitors, now dead to a man, are belatedly acknowledged by a worried Odysseus to have been the "bulwark" (ἕρμα) of the city (*Od.* 23. 121). In the Underworld (*Od.* 11. 556) Ajax is called by Odysseus τοῖος … πύργος ("what a tower"); this is a tower that came crashing down, however, upon the point of his own sword in a fit of shame and resentment. An armed phalanx of Achaeans is referred to as a πύργος ("tower") at *Il.* 4. 334 (there are ten of these formations at 4. 347), a metaphor perhaps inspired in part by the shields that they carry, which are "like towers" (σάκος ἠΰτε πύργον), as at *Il.* 7. 219; 11. 485; 17. 128.[78] Women, too, may be flattered with comparisons with architectural elements in Homer. Nausicaa is unmistakably assimilated to the "ridge-pole of the well-made roof" (σταθμὸν τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο, *Od.* 8. 458) that she stands alongside as she gazes in wonder at Odysseus; the same sleight-of-hand had been performed with Penelope at *Od.* 1. 333, and among the

[76] Sentiments as may be found in most commentaries on *Tr.*

[77] For the Indo-European roots of these poetic tropes, see Rüdiger Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1967), § 581.

[78] When forces "array themselves in a tower-like formation" (πυργηδὸν σφέας αὐτοὺς ἀρτύναντες) at *Il.* 12. 43; 13. 152, the expression πυργηδόν begins to sound like a technical military term; however, that the metaphorical overtones are still intact is suggested by *Il.* 15. 618, where such a formation is compared to a great rocky sea cliff. Moreover, the simile at *Il.* 16. 212–217, where soldiers mustering themselves into a phalanx are compared to a man building a wall with tightly packed stones, perhaps aids our understanding of the impetus behind such metaphorical uses of πύργος.

many ways that Homer finds to extol the latter's qualities, it is no surprise that the semiotics of columns feature prominently, as Michael Nagler has argued.[79] We shall return to the imagery of columns-as-supporting-members later in the chapter.

Such motifs continue to be developed throughout the Archaic and Classical periods. Among the verses attributed to Theognis (233–234 [West]), for instance, the poet speaks of a "good man" who, while "being a citadel and a tower" (ἀκρόπολις καὶ πύργος ἐών) to his people, receives only slight honors from an empty-headed populace. The trope is taken up with zeal by the tragedians. Compare the accolade by the chorus of suppliant maidens to King Pelasgus of Argos at Aeschylus' *Suppliants* 370: σύ τοι πόλις, σὺ δὲ τὸ δήμιον ("You, I am certain, are the city, and you, the sovereign people"). Oedipus, we are told by the chorus of Theban elders at Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* 1200–1201, had been hailed in heroic terms as a "tower against death" (θανάτων … πύργος)[80] for the people of Thebes in a now hollow accolade reiterated in astonishment at the revelation of the incestuous nature of his marriage and immanent downfall. The chorus at Sophocles' *Ajax* 158–159, in a direct address to Ajax, count the rabble as members of that species of weak men who, when they are separated from their superiors, amount to a "tottering buttress of a tower" (σφαλερὸν πύργου ῥῦμα), that is to say, they are incapable of defending themselves or anyone else—an obvious, and indeed now pathetic, given Ajax' present state, comparison with the ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν, himself.[81]

The inverse trope also enjoyed literary currency. Even as architecture's intrinsic qualities lend themselves quite logically to metaphors for humans with comparable qualities, it is just as true that a city's male populace, if of sufficient moral fiber, serves equally well as a kind of metaphorical surrogate for that city's walls. Any great city, in other words, is no more or no less than a sum of its inhabitants, since it is the stamina and durability of its people, rather than its fortifications, that transform

---

[79] Michael N. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition. A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1974), pp. 153–156.

[80] For this use of the genitive, see R.D. Dawe, *Sophocles Oedipus Rex* (1982; rev. Cambridge, Eng., 2006), p. 176, ad loc.

[81] Taking πύργου as a subjective genitive, I understand the expression as the antithesis to something like "fine figure of a man," and thereby a metaphorical reference; Richard C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Pt. 7. *The Ajax* (Cambridge, Eng., 1896), p. 35, however, takes it as an objective genitive and therefore a direct reference to the (poor) defense *of* the city walls: "Not, 'tower of defence,'" says Jebb.

a loose cluster of built structures into a secure, habitable, civilized place. Thus Aeschylus' *Persians* 349 has the messenger responding to the queen mother's hopeful query about the destruction of Athens that the city still stands: "For her walls are intact as long as there are living men" (ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἕρκος ἐστὶν ἀσφαλές). "Neither tower (read: walls) nor ship amounts to anything if devoid of the men who dwell inside" (ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς / ἐρῆμος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω), as the chorus remind Oedipus at Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* 56–57. It begins to sound like a truism when Thucydides (7. 77. 7) reports the Athenian general Nicias boasting: "For it is men that make the city, and walls and ships are naught without them" (ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τείχη οὐδὲ νῆες ἀνδρῶν κεναί). The *locus classicus* of the sentiment, as it turns out, is Alcaeus fr. 112. 10 (Voigt): ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλι]ος πύργος ἀρεύι˻οι ("for warlike men are a tower of the city"), a line which is quoted with admiration and elaborated upon by, among others, the Roman-era rhetor Aelius Aristides (*Or.* 46. 207): "… the words which the poet Alcaeus spoke long ago and which all and sundry have since borrowed from him, that cities are not stones or timbers or the craft of builders; but wherever there are men who know how to defend themselves, *there* are walls and cities."[82] Euripides contributes his own account of the Alcaean line, in fr. 828 (*Phryxos*) (αἱ γὰρ πόλεις εἴσ' ἄνδρες, οὐκ ἐρημία), which is less easy to render, but the sense is clear: "for cities are [made up of] men, not empty [shells of buildings]."

In *Trojan Women*, Troy itself, as Adrian Poole has pointed out, is transformed, "before our eyes," into an ἐρημία, a term which is usually rendered as "desolation, desert, wilderness," but which Poole prefers to interpret here as a reference to a place "where man *is not*."[83] This "emptying" of the signs of civilization is seen as both the *cause* (as at

[82] Trans. David A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric*, 1 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1982), p. 427. There are several renditions, ancient and modern, of the Alcaean line, with minor differences that do not, however, greatly affect the meaning. I follow Eva-Maria Voigt, ed., *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta* (Amsterdam, 1971), and Campbell, op. cit., p. 284, in printing ἀρεύι˻οι (ἀρήϊοι, schol. S. *OT* 56; Suid. A 3843 [Adler]), rather than ἀρεύ[ιος (schol. A. *Pers.* 352), which Lobel and Page print. (The Aeolic form ἀρεύ … is certified by the papyrus; Lobel and Page, p. 158.) This preference finds support in the testimonium of Aristid. *Or.* 46. 207. Additional renditions and reflections of the Alcaean sentiment are found in D. 18. 299–300; Cic. *Att.* 7. 11; Plu. *Lyc.* 19. 4; D.C. 56. 3. Rush Rehm, *The Play of Space. Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton and Oxford, 2002), p. 114, with further primary and secondary sources in n. 3, also discusses the trope that people are the city in Greek society.

[83] Poole, "Total Disaster," p. 264; cf. the discussion of "eremetic" space by Rehm, *The Play of Space*, pp. 114–115.

vv. 15–16, 26–27, 96–97, where the term appears in various forms to refer to the neglect of the gods and their sacred spaces) and the *result* (e.g., vv. 562–567 [καράτομος ἐρημία, "beheaded emptiness," said of the beds of the slaughtered Phrygians] and passim) of Poseidon's and Athena's abandonment of the city to its doom. Poole considers ἐρημία, to be a "particularly Euripidean word, in its association with a place or state or relationship that *was* once full, rich, substantial, informed by presence, and that is now empty, hollow, drained, inhabited only by an absence." He continues: "It would seem that the word is particularly fitted for conveying the sense of the positive loss of something precious—the absence of which is felt not simply as blankness, but as an aching, vicious, wound."[84] Thus it seems that the emptying of a city of men and their civilized habits reduces a city to figurative ruins, and real ruination, that is, of the built structures that once both housed and advertised those habits, inevitably follows.

Euripides makes fullest use of the traditional topoi that applied the technical language associated with walls and towers as metaphors for the very best of the men who defend their cities. The "tower of safety" (πύργος ἀσφαλής) that Medea (*Med.* 390) hopes for will turn out to be Aegeus, the king of Athens, but she will never, of course, truly escape from her deed. Another heroine, Alcestis, on the verge of death, in her farewell speech to her husband observes that her boy will be fortunate in possessing a "great tower" (πύργον μέγαν, *Alc.* 311) in the person of a protective and mentoring father, while she worries that her daughter will lack the female equivalent in a mother. While she is undoubtedly right about the latter, the former must be regarded with some degree of skepticism in light of the play's own action: Admetus is no model for upstanding behavior and furthermore, his own father, has demonstrated himself to be no "tower" for *his* son. More loosely, Euripides' frequent uses of the word πέργαμος (capitalized in some texts) of the city of Troy in *Trojan Women* might also fall into this category, if one follows Rehm that the suffix γάμος ("wedding" or "pairing") plays into its meaning, as, for instance, at *Tr.* 598, when Paris is said by Andromache to have destroyed "the towers of Troy" (πέργαμα Τροίας) for the sake of a hateful marriage bed.[85] If, as it seems from the above examples, architectural metaphors become most expedient when applied to those either flirting with disaster or noticeably *lacking* in the backbone suggested by the architectural

[84] Poole, "Total Disaster," pp. 264–265; see also p. 268.
[85] Rehm, *Marriage to Death*, p. 210, n. 10.

analogy, it may be because of the very fallibility that inevitably inheres to mankind's, as opposed to nature's, creations. In another sense Euripides may be no more than the inheritor of a long-established poetic tradition of tapping this truism. It is true that, in and of itself, the subject matter of *Trojan Women* offered a perfect opportunity for exploiting the familiar, architecturally-inspired tropes. Yet, while the use of architectural language with mostly metaphorical sense cannot claim to be without parallel in Greek literature, the sheer concentration of this language in one play and the degree to which it inflects the play's action and the pathos that it generates alone speak on behalf of an unprecedented role for architecture in this particular drama. As we now proceed to examine the occurrences of architectural language in *Trojan Women* as well as throughout the corpus of Euripides, we shall find this tragedian breathing new life into some hackneyed poetical devices, inventing some others and, as was his habit, always discovering ways to make the material his own.

The Language of Architecture

The above references to specific buildings and landmarks, while they help to make the case for the dominance of architectural language in *Trojan Women*, need little commentary, aside from noting their abundance. More important for our purposes are the less often observed examples of artisanal-inspired language to be discovered in close reading of the text of the play. While some of these terms certainly turn up elsewhere in Greek poetry, others, as we shall see, are used exclusively or nearly so by Euripides. There are at least eight major instances of the use of specific technical language associated with architecture, four of which, appropriately enough, are articulated by Poseidon, the architect of the walls.[86] Metaphorical and other figural uses of architectural language are also richly in evidence.[87] In order to understand the extent to which Euripides immerses his audience in the language of architecture in *Trojan Woman*, and to appreciate more fully both the degree of technical sophistication and the poetics of this language, we shall examine both the technical and the figural usages in some detail. Along the way, an overview of Euripides' uses of this language in other plays will reinforce my contention that, when he adopts technical terminology, this playwright does

[86] *Tr.* 4–6, 16–17, 45–46, 47 (all spoken by Poseidon), 215, 489, 508, 814–815.
[87] *Tr.* 118, 215, 489, 508, 612–613, 843–845.

so with the conscious intention to exploit it for its full literal, linguistic, and poetic potential.[88] Among the architectural terms to be discussed are: κρηπίς, βάθρον, ὀρθοστάτης, στῦλος/κίων, σταθμός, περικίων, εὐκίονες/εὐστύλων, θριγός, γεῖσον, παστάς, τέραμνα, τρίγλυφος, ἔμβολον, κρήδεμνον, τοῖχος/τεῖχος, the epithet "Cyclopean," and the verb, πυργόω.

Foundations

When we learn at *Tr.* 16 that the aged king Priam has met his death, according to Poseidon, πρὸς δὲ κρηπίδων βάθροις of the altar of Zeus Herkeios,[89] we are introduced to two architectural terms of which Euripides is especially fond: κρηπίς and βάθρον. Noteworthy here is the combination of two architectural terms to characterize the site of an important death—notwithstanding the likelihood that the image even then represents a synecdoche[90]—suggesting that architectural precision is part of the intended effect; compare *HF* 715, where Megara sits or kneels as a suppliant at the foot of the shrine to Hestia in her home and only one of the terms is used to characterize it (ἁγνοῖς … βάθροις).[91] While it may seem like hair-splitting to try to distinguish the two terms, their juxtaposition at *Tr.* 16 nonetheless invites us to try. βάθρα generally may be taken refer to the foundations, proper, that is, the laid stone courses that do not show above ground, though it is not documented in building inscriptions as such.[92] On the other hand, κρηπίς (crepis or crepidoma, in modern usage, following ancient) should refer to the three steps which

[88] Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 44, also notes E.'s preference for "termini technici."

[89] For a recent discussion of the earlier literary tradition for the setting of the death of Priam, see Anderson, *The Fall of Troy*, pp. 28–38; and for a full account of the visual record, see Hedreen, *Capturing Troy*, pp. 64–90.

[90] Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 104.

[91] The interpretation of Godfrey W. Bond, *Euripides Heracles* (Oxford, 1981), p. 250, is perhaps too narrow, given E.'s fondness for this term: "Every hearth needs a βάθρον to contain fire and ashes." Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 56, with references, points out that there are no permanent central hearths documented archaeologically for Greek houses of the Classical period: "Instead, portable braziers (of terracotta or bronze) and small fires on the dirt floor (of charcoal or brushwood) were the rule."

[92] Technical usage is not hard and fast; for instance, one might reasonably expect βάθρα to appear in *IG* II^2 1671, a fourth-century BC building inscription from Eleusis, which offers, according to Philip H. Davis, *Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions of the Fourth Century Before Christ* (Diss.: Princeton, 1931), p. 30, who examines it in full, "some rare information on the laying of foundations." The terms used there to refer to the foundations, however, are στρῶμα (lines 11, 13–14) or, even more simply, τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ

comprise the outer edge of the platform or pedestal of a temple, not the foundations, proper.[93] This use of the term is documented, for example, in a building inscription of 409/8 BC from the Erechtheum (*IG* I³ 474, II [col. I] 67), and in a fourth-century BC building inscription from Eleusis (*IG* II² 1671. 4).[94]

Now the third step alone on which the columns rest is the "stylobate." Though στυλοβάτης, itself, is not found in Euripides nor anywhere else in Greek poetry outside of one occurrence in comedy, it will be useful for understanding the specificity surrounding the structure of temple foundations as featured in Euripides. Again, modern usage generally follows the ancient; in a building inscription associated with the fourth-century BC temple of Asclepius at Epidauros (*IG* IV² [1] 102. 7–8), the three steps are referred to as "the visible crepis and the stylobate" (τᾶς ἐ[π]ιφα[νέος κρη]πῖδος καὶ στυλοβάτα), and in *IG* II² 1670. 36–37, the stylobate is put "upon the crepis" (ἐπὶ τῆς κρηπῖδο[ς). Thus, in the case of a temple, the term κρηπίς alludes to a finished part of the structure, and, in treading on the crepis or crepidoma, one would then already be within the architectural bounds of the temple proper. This is what is indicated at *Andr.* 1111–1112, ἔρχεται δ' ἀνακτόρων / κρηπῖδος ἐντός (loosely, "and he surmounted the crepis, going inside the cella"), said of Neoptolemus' fatal entry into the temple of Delphi; moments later, as the

---

τὴν κρηπίδα ("the blocks under the crepis," line 4). In inscriptions the singular βάθρον is more typically used of statue bases (e.g., *IG* I³ 472. 150, 157, 158, associated with the *agalmata* of Athena and Hephaistos in the Hephaisteion, ca. 420 BC).

93 Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2 (Berlin, 1895) p. 257, discussing *HF* 1261, includes the foundations, themselves, in the range of possible meanings of κρηπίς. In the case of *Tr.* 16, however, since two terms appear, as typically in E., we should look for a distinction in their meanings.

94 *IG* I³ 474, II contains a list of unfinished building parts found "in the vicinity of the corner of the Kekropeion" (line 9) on the Athenian acropolis; among the items listed is "the entire crepis, in a circle, unsmoothed (or unpolished)" (τὴν κρηπῖδα ἐγ κύκλοι ἅπασαν ἀκατάξεστον, lines 67–68), language which suggests that the visible portions of the foundations are meant, rather than the parts below ground. Foundation blocks are not in need of a final polish, and the fact that the blocks were found placed in a circle, as were the unfinished "orthostates" (ἐγ κύκλ[οι, line 61), could imply that they were arranged in the general vicinity and configuration of their eventual placement. That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed by the discussion by L.D. Caskey in James M. Paton, ed., *The Erechtheum. Measured, Drawn, and Restored by Gorham Phillips Stevens* (Cambridge, MA, 1927), p. 309: "κρηπίς designates, as usually in building inscriptions, that part of the substructure which was above ground and visible, i.e., in the case of the Erechtheum the steps and the stylobate." Davis, *Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions*, pp. 35–39, with fig. 3, discusses in detail how the foundations under the crepis were to be constructed, according to the guidelines given in *IG* II² 1671.

messenger relates, the wounded son of Achilles would seize votive armor hanging somewhere within the doorway in a desperate but vain attempt to fend off his attackers.[95] Hermes places the infant Ion κρηπίδων ἔπι at *Ion* 38, which is more likely the stylobate than the steps.[96] By the same logic the crowd of female servants of Creusa greeted by Ion at *Ion* 510 are milling around the steps of the temple (τῶνδ᾽ ἀμφὶ κρηπῖδας δόμων), but not on them.[97] Preserving the distinction between "foundations" and "crepidoma" lends nuance to the metaphorical use of κρηπίς at *HF* 1261–1262, where Heracles observes that, "whenever the crepis [crepidoma or stylobate] of a family is not laid down level (ὀρθῶς), the offspring will be forced to suffer misfortune." While "foundations" is possible, "crepis" or "crepidoma," as defined above, is, I think, better on account of ὀρθῶς, which suggests a degree of refinement in the leveling operation more appropriate to the latter; one pictures columns (sons?) teetering on an imperfectly horizontal platform.[98]

In the case of the altar at which Priam died at *Tr.* 16, by using multiple terms, Euripides recognizes the distinction among foundations, steps, and stylobate or platform, even though he does not necessarily adopt the usual terminology.[99] It is possible that βάθροις in fact refers to the crepidoma and κρηπίδων, itself, to the top step only, the stylobate. Or,

---

95 As a scholiast at Ar. *Eq.* 845 (Dindorf) explains, handles and the like were removed from shields hung as dedications for precisely this reason, so that they could not be reused; see Mike Lippman, David Scahill, and Peter Schultz, "*Knights* 843–859, the Nike Temple Bastion, and Cleon's Shields from Pylos," *American Journal of Archaeology* 110 (2006), 551–563.

96 *Pace* Paley[2] 2, p. 12. K.H. Lee, *Euripides Ion* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1997), p. 164, has: "the area above the temple steps and in front of the doorway." R.P. Winnington-Ingram, "The Delphic Temple in Greek Tragedy," in *Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J.C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 483–500 (492), agrees that "stylobate" is correct, but is uncertain as to exactly where on the stylobate: "… whether the basket was placed in the *peristyle* or the *pronaos* or inside the *naos* is not specified." The term is probably best taken to refer specifically to the floor of the peristyle.

97 Paley[2] 2, p. 43, suggests the steps of the altars. The use of δόμων, however, would seem to favor the temple.

98 At the risk of overreaching, I am tempted to translate κρηπίς at *HF* 1261 with the technical term "euthynteria," or leveling-course, that is, the very finely-turned masonry course which is laid between the invisible foundations and the crepis or crepidoma and ensures that the crepis will be level even if the foundations are not.

99 The line drawings in Dimitra Aktseli, *Altäre in der archaischen und klassischen Kunst: Untersuchungen zu Typologie und Ikonographie* (Internationale Archäologie) 28 (Espelkamp, 1996), figs. 1–18, illustrate the wide variety of altar types that are documented by representations in art and actual preserved remains; most feature a distinct platform or base and some feature steps; a black-figure skyphos showing a stepped altar with figures ascending is illustr. in pl. 9. 2–3.

alternatively, βάθροις could simply refer to the fact that the three steps rest on a foundation, but that the action took place in reference to the steps rather than the parts below ground. Either interpretation makes it more likely that Priam died on the altar rather than "near" or "in front of" it, as *Tr.* 16 is usually translated, with the use of πρός (in the sense of "clinging closely to," LSJ, s. v. b, i, 4) implying that the old man died pathetically as he was negotiating (read: crawling up on hands and knees) the steps of the altar. The numerous vase-paintings of the death of Priam show him in various aspects but always in close physical contact with the altar.[100]

Euripides is acutely aware of the evocative potential of the term βάθρον aside from its strictly literal sense as a way to refer to structural foundations that lie beneath the ground, even though he seldom, if ever, disregards the literal entirely.[101] While the plural frequently substitutes for the singular due to the metrical requirements of Greek poetry without remark, there are certainly occasions when significance may be attached to the preference of one over the other.[102] So the plural βάθρα often serves as a synecdoche for temple or sacred precinct, as at *Ph.* 982: σεμνὰ Δωδώνης βάθρα (compare ἁγνὰ Δ̣ωδώνη̣<ς> βάθρα at fr. 494. 15 [*Mel.D.*]), where it refers to Zeus' oracular sanctuary at Dodona, or,

---

[100] Examples: H.A. Shapiro, *Myth into Art. Poet and Painter in Classical Greece* (London and New York, 1994), fig. 116; Susan Woodford, *The Trojan War in Ancient Art* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), figs. 101–102; Jane Henle, *Greek Myths. A Vase Painter's Notebook* (Bloomington, ID, 1973), figs. 70, 71, and 73; Aktseli, *Altäre*, pls. 2. 1 and 2; 7. 2. For a full recent description of the treatment of the subject on vases, see Anderson, *The Fall of Troy*, pp. 192–199, with illustrations. Anderson, op. cit., pp. 37, 95, and 195, with n. 9 (from which, the following quotation), emphasizes the significance of the altar in the Ilioupersis tradition and in this scene in particular: "Without exception the [death of Priam] is depicted at the altar of Zeus Herkeios" which "would have been a particularly potent image in late Archaic and Classical Athens, where [the altar of Z.H.] still served as a focal point of the home." The altar is identified with an inscription on two depictions by Onesimos (Anderson, op. cit., pp. 195 and 239, cat. nos. 15–16). E.'s specificity in describing the structure at *Tr.* 16 accords well with the evidence of its singular importance to the scene.

[101] Cf. M.J. Cropp in C. Collard, M.J. Cropp, and K.H. Lee, eds., *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays*, 1 (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1995) [hereafter cited as Collard, Cropp, and Lee], p. 273: "Eur. uses βάθρα 'foundations' to the point of cliché in such evocative descriptions."

[102] See Basil L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes* (Groningen, 1980), § 52, for the "Pluralis Maiestatis," with several architectural terms given as examples, citing Arist. *Rh.* 3. 6 on the use of the plural for "majesty" or "dignity" (ὄγκος) of speech.

less exaltedly, to someone's domicile, including a mountain dwelling of the centaurs (*IA* 705). The βάθροις of Athens at fr. 360. 47 (*Erec.*) (Austin fr. 50) possibly refer to the acropolis. At fr. 370. 95 of the same play Athena assures Praxithea that she has "re-erected the foundations of the city" (πόλεως τῆσδ' ἐξανώρθωσας βάθρα), which Martin Cropp adduces to mean, in a pure metaphorical sense, "set upright out (of misfortune)."[103] However, with Euripides, we should not underestimate the literal: Foundations, in fact, will soon be laid for new cult structures on the Athenian acropolis, including, perhaps, the classical Erechtheum. While it may seem implausible to think of "re-erecting" a new structure, grammatical correctness is not the point here. We shall have occasion to return to this much-debated passage.

The implications of the plural in reference to the city of Troy are most obvious in *Trojan Women* when, for example, we are told that Troy would still be ἐν βάθροις, if it were not for Athena's destroying her (*Tr.* 47). Literally, the buildings would still stand on their foundations and, figuratively, Troy as an entity and as a symbol of a civilization's greatness might still survive. Similarly, when a maddened Heracles threatens to destroy the Κυκλώπων βάθρα of Mycenae at *HF* 944, a feat of which we know him to be capable, this is first to say that he would like physically to reduce the Cyclopean walls to their foundations and only second, to destroy the very heart and soul of that city. In both of these senses the destruction of the βάθρα of Troy is also invoked at *Hel.* 1652, an annihilation to which, we are told, Helen herself lent her name, linguistically, as "destroyer" (ἑλεῖν) of the city, and as the sole stated reason for the expedition. By contrast, perhaps, the singular βάθρον is used to refer to the pre-sacked citadel at *IA* 1263; there, Agamemnon's anticipation of sacking a famous city does not merit the full ideational weight of the plural, since the magnitude of the destruction is yet unknown and will likely be worse than anyone might have imagined. The plural is used again, in this case, of the Trojan walls, alone, at *Supp.* 1198 as a reminder of their earlier destruction by Heracles,[104] an event which is described in great detail by the chorus at *Tr.* 799–820. It is entirely possible that Euripides is spoofing his own preference for using the term βάθρα in association with the destruction of Troy when he applies this same language to humorous

[103] Cropp, in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 193, citing comparanda from S., E., and elsewhere.
[104] Timothy Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD, and London, 1993), pp. 400–402.

effect at *Cyc.* 351–352. There, Odysseus parodies his present predicament when he characterizes himself as having arrived at a state of deep danger (κἀπὶ κινδύνου βάθρα) worse than the tribulations he faced at Troy. The humor lies in the use of recognizable, over-inflated tragic language to describe a situation that is ludicrous by comparison, but there may also be a reminder that the Cyclopes are famed builders of βάθρα, a point to which we shall return. It could be argued that, because the expressions ἐν βάθροις and ἐκ βάθρων are relatively common, they retain little of the artisanal associations of the lexical meaning of the term. However, Euripides' repeated uses of this term, in both the singular and the plural, in its correct, or nearly correct, architectural sense argues against such a conclusion.[105]

Euripides also uses βάθρα in the plural as a term for "statue base," a technical application paralleled in building inscriptions such as *IG* IV^2 (1) 102 A 100, again from the fourth-century BC temple of Asclepius at Epidauros, where it is used of a base for an acroterion, though it is more typically found in the singular when used this way in inscriptions. In a particularly effective example, at *IT* 1157–1158 (cf. v. 1201), βάθρα refers to the pedestal on which the *agalma* of Artemis, now in the arms of Iphigenia, once stood, immovable: "Why, child of Agamemnon, did you snatch from its immovable pedestal (ἐξ ἀκινήτων βάθρων) this statue of the goddess which you now hold in your arms?" The stone base or pedestal, pointedly empty of its wooden statue, had also been called κρηπῖδας at vv. 996–997 (… ἡνίκ' ἂν κενὰς/κρηπῖδας εὕρῃ λαΐνας ἀγάλματος, "… whenever [Thoas] discovers the stone crepis bereft of its image"). The terms, as we have seen, can be interchangeable; in both cases the plurals could allude to the fact that a statue base is commonly stepped.[106] The use of ἀκινήτων at *IT* 1157 to characterize the base of a statue represents a clear case of Euripidean irony. Although the base is indeed immovable, and still stands, the statue apparently is not, and has been removed. Platnauer believes that ἀκινήτων has "a gerundival sense"

---

105 While the term is a great favorite with E., appearing in nine different plays, in most cases, on more than one occasion, and in a number of fragments, it also appears not infrequently in S. and at A. *Pers.* 812. With more than 1600 "hits" in *TLG*, it cannot be considered rare. So, too, κρηπίς, which, while quite popular in E., also occurs at A. *Pers.* 815 (which Housman, however, emended to κρηνίς), S. *Tr.* 993, and in Pindar. Neither is it particularly rare (some 900 "hits" in *TLG*).

106 Poulheria Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte) 80 (Berlin and New York, 2006), p. 323.

meaning "that must not be disturbed."[107] However, the irony behind this use of the modifier is hard to miss: A statue, which cannot normally move of its own accord, has nonetheless been separated from its base. The trope is familiar enough from numerous ancient testimonia about the works of Daidalos[108] and from such wide-ranging sources as the famous opening of Pindar's *Nemean* 5. 1–3, where the poet boasts that he is not a portrait-sculptor (ἀνδριαντοποιός) making dedications (ἀγάλματ') that are condemned to stand still on their bases, and Aristophanes' *Frogs* 538–540, where a man standing still and doing nothing is compared with a γεγραμμένην εἰκόν'. A statue base rather than building foundations might better be thought of at *HF* 1306–1307, where Heracles protests that he has been turned upside-down "to his very foundations" (αὐτοῖσιν βάθροις ἄνω κάτω) as a result of the machinations of Hera.[109] *El.* 608 might be compared, where the old man informs Orestes that he has forfeited everything, including hope, in the eyes of his friends, effectively using ἐκ βάθρων to suggest that Agamemnon's son has been reduced to "the depths." In the singular κρηπίς is used of the platform of a tomb in a particularly rich characterization of a funerary monument at *Hel.* 547.

The term κρηπίς is also found in the context of domestic architecture, the most vivid evocation of which may be found in *Heracles*. In his rage to kill his own children, and amidst a maelstrom of collapsed architectural members and frightened, fleeing boys, Heracles twice confronts a form of crepidoma. At *HF* 984–985 the second son makes a futile attempt to avoid his father's bow by crouching behind the steps of the pedestal of the altar (ἀμφὶ βωμίαν / … κρηπῖδ'), which is probably set in the courtyard, only to meet his death at close range by a crushing blow from Heracles' club.[110] And at *HF* 1008 Heracles himself is stopped by a blow from a rock hurled by Athena; he falls, striking his back against a column which has fallen on the crepidoma, which is more properly, here, the stylobate. Domestic architecture of the Classical period provided an obvious and immediate source of inspiration, at least in part, for Euripides' characterization of a Bronze age house.[111] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff observes

---

[107] M. Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia in Taurus* (Oxford, 1960), p. 158; cf. Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 374.

[108] Conveniently collected in Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 342–344.

[109] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 391–392, observes: "this idiom … is especially used in contexts of destruction;" he compares *Med.* 164: αὐτοῖς μελάθροις διακναιομένους.

[110] Cf. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 321.

[111] The bibliography on the ancient Greek house is vast. In a useful overview Michael Jameson, "Private Space and the Greek City," in *The Greek City From Homer to Alexander*,

that Heracles' palace "naturally has the layout of an Attic house." He goes on to conclude that, while Euripides indeed modeled Heracles' house after one of his own time and place, coincidentally, Bronze age or "Homeric" houses, as evidenced by the excavated Palace at Tiryns, feature a strikingly similar format.[112]

The houses which have been excavated at Olynthos in Chalcidice offer the most complete evidence for domestic architecture of the Classical period. Typically, they feature an off-center courtyard surrounded by colonnaded verandas, together forming the largest unit of the multi-roomed structure.[113] The tiled roofs over the verandas were supported by wooden posts rather than stone columns, but in some cases, stone capitals surmounted the wooden posts, presumably lending them a more stately, "columnar," look. In many cases an altar for household worship was found in the courtyard.[114] Evidence for Attic houses of the fifth century is considerably more meager. The area southwest of the agora between the agora and the Areopagus has provided the best archaeological evidence for Athenian houses of the Classical period.[115] The

---

Oswyn Murray and Simon Price, eds. (Oxford, 1990), pp. 171–195, shows that the archaeological evidence does not support some of the commonplaces concerning Greek housing that are attested in literature, including a distinction between the men's and the women's areas, with the women's quarters on an upper floor, and the ubiquitous presence of a hearth and herms or other guardian figures at the door. For a recent consideration of how domestic space as portrayed in Greek tragedy matches up against the archaeological evidence, taking into account the argumentation of Jameson, see Rehm, *The Play of Space*, pp. 54–57, with references to the relevant literature.

[112] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 206–207: "natürlich die anlage eines attischen hauses hat."

[113] Jameson, "Private Space and the Greek City," pp. 179–181, calls the court "the indispensable feature of the Greek house, no matter what the normal house of the particular town or region may be, nor what historical development has led to this result." He emphasizes that "privacy, in effect being invisible to the outside world, was the major aim of these houses" (p. 183). Cf. Rehm, *The Play of Space*, pp. 56–57.

[114] A.W. Lawrence, *Greek Architecture* (1957; 5th ed. rev. by R.A. Tomlinson, New Haven and London, 1996) [hereafter cited as Lawrence/Tomlinson], pp. 182–189, esp. 183–185; fig. 317, a restored plan of the so-called "Villa of Good Fortune," shows a typical Olynthian house including a courtyard with an altar at its center. The standard publications are D.M. Robinson and J.W. Graham, *Excavations at Olynthus*, 8: *The Hellenic House* (Baltimore, MD, 1938) and D.M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus*, 12: *Domestic and Public Architecture* (Baltimore, MD, 1946); see also now Nicholas Cahill, *Household and City Organization at Olynthos* (New Haven, 2002). The late fourth-century houses which have been excavated at nearby Pella (Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 185), show evidence of greater wealth, with their elaborate mosaics and peristyles of stone columns.

[115] Homer Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, 14: *The Agora of Athens* (Princeton, 1972), pp. 173–185.

excavated contents of these houses suggest that, although they are quite simple, the houses were occupied by men of some means, bearing out, for the most part, according to Homer Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, the claim of Demosthenes (3. 26 and 29) that, in the "good old days" of Periclean Athens, none among the most illustrious men lived in a house that was "more stately" (σεμνοτέραν) than those of his neighbors.[116] Of course, Heracles did not live in Classical times; therefore, a certain amount of poetic license is to be expected in Euripides' characterization of his family home. I cannot, however, share Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's premise that Euripides would have exhibited such an indifference to archaeological accuracy in blindly mimicking a house of his own day in a characterization of a Bronze age dwelling.

Euripides employs both βάθρον and κρηπίς in less obviously suitable contexts as well. In one of *Trojan Women*'s simplest yet loveliest metaphors, the plains of Thessaly are called the κρηπίς of Mount Olympus (*Tr.* 215). Lee has observed: "The low-lying plain of Thessaly is called, not inappropriately, the base or foundation of Mt. Olympus whose southern slopes rise at the boundary of northern Thessaly."[117] The geographical configuration perfectly suits the idea of κρηπίς as crepidoma, that is, visibly stepped base, rather than foundations proper, as it is sometimes translated. In the plural βάθρα, too, is used of a land formation, the rocky peninsula between the narrow straits that is Aulis (στενόπορ᾽ Αὐλίδος βάθρα, *IA* 81), where, perhaps, the architectural language is meant also as a reminder of the temple of Artemis located there. Thus Euripides successfully exploits the subtle distinctions between κρηπίς and βάθρα in choosing architectural metaphors to characterize two vastly different topographical situations.

---

[116] Thompson and Wycherley, *Agora* 14, p. 182: "We do not yet have the house of a Kallias; but even the modest dwellings on the Areopagus slope were occupied by men of moderate means, to judge by their contents, which include fine pottery." Demosthenes might even have had contemporary Olynthian houses in mind as he spoke. A larger, more elaborate house of Demosthenes' own day, the late fourth century, is situated to the south of the Areopagus and thus farther from the agora than the others; the so-called "House of the Greek Mosaic" is, in the estimation of Thompson and Wycherley, op. cit., pp. 180–182, with fig. 44 and pl. 89, "in the scale of sophistication and domestic comfort," more in line with the "best Olynthian standards." Unlike the other examples, it includes columned porticos around three sides of its courtyard; of these Thompson and Wycherley (loc. cit.) acknowledge that, although these porticos appear to belong to a "somewhat later reconstruction," "it is not unlikely that there was at least one portico from the beginning in such a comparatively spacious court."

[117] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 105.

Noteworthy for their archaeological specificity are a couple of appearances of βάθρον. The singular form at *IT* 962 has been identified by alert commentators as a reference to one of the two "unhewn stones" (ἀργοὺς λίθους) on the Areopagus at Athens, one called "of Hubris" and the other, "of Shamelessness," on which stood the accused and the accuser in a murder trial, according to Pausanias (1. 28. 5).[118] At *El.* 706–707 a herald steps up onto πετρίνοις … βάθροις at Mycenae to make a proclamation; some sort of pedestal or platform, whether natural or man-made, is indicated, such as the famous "herald's stone" in the agora of Athens which Solon is said to have mounted in order to declaim his influential poem, "Salamis" (Plu. *Sol.* 8).[119]

A surprising appearance of the term that has proved puzzling to commentators occurs at *Ph.* 1179, in the messenger's account of the death of Capaneus. The rungs of the ladder scaled by Capaneus in the attempt to storm the walls of Thebes are described with the periphrasis, κλίμακος

---

118 Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 141; M.J. Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 2000), p. 232; Paley² 3, p. 407: "Euripides appears to describe the still-existing aspect of the Areopagus. 'A raised block,' says Dr. Wordsworth [Wordsworth, *Athens and Attica*, p. 74], 'still remains on the east and west side, perhaps the two assigned by Euripides to the accuser and the criminal.'" James George Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (1897; 2nd ed. London, 1913) [hereafter cited as Frazer], 2, p. 364, also quotes Wordsworth, but introduces the quotation in the following way: "Some have fancied they could identify the two stones with two blocks standing on the platform on the top of the hill." Frazer collects additional ancient testimonia about these two stones, which he suggests "may have been altar-shaped blocks," and points to "a cameo and a vase-painting" (from C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, 1 [Paris 1877], pp. 398–399, figs. 491, 493) in which the accused Orestes, at his acquittal, "is seen with his right foot planted on a rough stone, probably the stone of Injury." The trial of Orestes is one of those mentioned by Pausanias. Walther Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (1931; repr. Chicago, IL, 1994), p. 300, makes no mention of these blocks. K.W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), p. 49, commenting on Paus. 1. 28. 5 in the context of Pausanias' fascination with the notion of antiquity conveyed by "unwrought stones": "This is a clear case of the technically simple unwrought stone indicating antiquity, and of antiquity in turn legitimizing, of age sanctioning a judicial procedure, reinforced by the association with the hero Orestes and one of the formative trials of Greek myth-history." Alan L. Boegehold, *The Athenian Agora, Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 28: *The Lawcourts at Athens* (Princeton, 1995), pp. 46 and 131, mentions the passages from *IT* and Pausanias in his discussion of the identity, use, and location of the two stones. More recently W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes* (Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 143–144, reviews the ancient evidence and the modern literature on these stones and suggests, as well, biblical and other non-Greek parallels for the practice of standing on stones and using stones to swear oaths, with some discussion of its possible symbolism.

119 J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1952), p. 138.

... ξέστ᾽ ἐνηλάτων βάθρα, which, in light of the supportive aspect of the individual rungs that is reminiscent of the role of the foundations or support system for walls, altars, buildings, and statues, would seem to be a suitable use of this language. Donald Mastronarde appropriately translates "the footholds of the rungs" and correctly identifies it as a periphrasis for "rungs" with a defining genitive, while pointing out that others have wrongly assumed that two different parts of the ladder are indicated, with ἐνηλάτων referring to the uprights.[120] This is unlikely, since Euripides has a separate term for the uprights, ὀρθοστάτης, which he uses at *Supp.* 497, another description of the death of Capaneus in which the *positioning* of the ladder rather than the scaling is the subject. Collard suggests that κλιμάκων ὀρθοστάτας here seems tautologous, but that this may be explained by the use of the word ὀρθοστάτης, which, in his reasoning, would require further qualification on account of its rarity.[121] On the other hand, there would be no problem with tautology if the term is associated only with the uprights—not the rungs—of the ladder, which is what Capaneus would in fact be thrusting against the gates; compare *Ph.* 1179, where it seems that just the rungs are meant, even though two terms (i.e., ἐνηλάτων βάθρα) are used there as well. One again with Euripides, the level of detail in these descriptions of ladders is impressive evidence that, while he may not always be consistent nor even correct in his usage of technically specific language,

---

[120] Donald J. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae* (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), p. 476; cf. the translations and interpretations of Ober, "Hoplites and Obstacles," pp. 181–183, who treats the *Ph.* episode in a larger study of the techniques of hoplite assaults on the walls of an ancient city; and William A.P. Childs, *The City-Reliefs of Lycia* (Princeton, 1978), pp. 72–73, who associates the detailed imagery of *Ph.* 1172–1186 with rare examples of depictions of assaults of walls with ladders that are found on the Nereid Monument (Frieze II, Block 872, Childs, op. cit., fig. 11 and pl. 10. 2) and other city-reliefs from Lycia, noting of the Euripidean passage: "The image is the closest any Greek work comes to any of the Lycian reliefs, for Euripides seems to be describing the scene of the southeast wall of the heroon of Trysa (pl. 5. 1)." For the language, cf. also *Supp.* 497, discussed below, and S. fr. 314. 316 (*Ichneutai*), where ἐνήλατα ξύλα refer to the rails of a bedstead. The image of a man mounting a ladder in an assault of his enemy's towers appears on the shield of Eteocles at A. *Th.* 466–467, which is echoed by *Ph.* 1173–1174.

[121] Christopher Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, 2 vols. (Groningen, 1975), p. 242. Collard, citing Vegetius 4. 21, notes that "the first literary reference to ladders is in connexion with Capaneus, so that he became their 'inventor'." He refers to Vegetius' chapter, *De scalis sambuca exostra et tollennone* (A. Önnerfors, *P. Flavii Vegeti Renati Epitoma Rei Militaris* [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1995], pp. 221–222), where the story of Capaneus is related in connection with the first use of a ladder in a siege. I wonder whether there might also be a pun with ὀρθῶς in the previous line.

the playwright's intent may nonetheless be gauged by his use of more than one technical-sounding term, as at *Tr.* 16–17, the description of Priam's death at the altar of Zeus Herkeios.

As Collard suspected, forms of ὀρθοστάτης ("orthostate") are not common, appearing only in an array of technical and lexigraphical works and in building inscriptions.[122] Euripides is in fact the only non-technical writer who uses the term, and he uses it, remarkably, on four occasions. As with much of Euripides' architectural language, it cannot be considered "poetic" vocabulary. The more usual meaning of "orthostate," that is, as a technical designation for the large upright blocks standing vertically on their long edges which serve as the first (that is, the bottom-most) course of masonry in an isodomic or ashlar stone wall, is also attested in Euripides.[123] In the plural they form part of Proteus' tomb at *Hel.* 547. The blood of Heracles' murdered first son, as he is hit at close range with an arrow shot from his father's bow, splashes on the stone orthostates of the walls of the house (*HF* 980). This would be the course nearest the floor, and, from a practical point of view, the logical area for the blood of a small boy to land, whereas it might be imagined that an adult meeting the same fate might shed his or her blood at a higher level of the wall.[124] Another exceptional usage is found at *Ion* 1134, also to be discussed in a later chapter, where the term refers to the poles which are stood upright to form the framework of a tent that Ion erects at Delphi to celebrate his reunion with his father and which are about to be draped with ornate weavings. In this case ὀρθοστάταις likely also functions as a veiled allusion to the fact that, while the structure is admittedly ἀτοίχους ("without walls," v. 1133), what "walls" it shall have, including its orthostates, in the proper sense, will be formed by the textiles.[125]

---

[122] See LSJ, s. v.; cf. *TLG*. Epigraphical occurrences include *IG* I^3 474, II (col. I) 60, a building inscription of 409/8 BC from the Erechtheum; *IG* II^2 1668. 19, a fourth-century building inscription from Eleusis; *IG* IV^2 (1) 103 B 74, 82, a building inscription from Epidauros, also fourth-century.

[123] D.S. Robertson, *A Handbook of Greek & Roman Architecture* (Cambridge, Eng., 1929), p. 50, suggests that the orthostate course "is probably a survival from the period of sun-dried brick, when the orthostatai and their backing were alone of stone."

[124] Paley^2 3, p. 74 believes the use here is as a synonym for κίονας. It is true that the boy is chased around the column/s, but he falls backwards against the wall or onto the floor, in the process, staining or wetting with blood the stone of the wall nearest the floor (the orthostate course).

[125] Cf. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion* (Dublin and Zurich, 1926), p. 141; A.W. Verrall, *The Ion of Euripides* (Cambridge, Eng., 1890), p. 93; Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 282.

Columns and Supporting Members

In Euripides, as occasionally in real-life architecture, supporting members are not always consigned to supporting roles. In the case of columns, which are virtually synonymous with the very notion of support and which form the basis of the classical "orders," the supporting elements are, on occasion, featured in starring roles.[126] A column or a pillar (the latter, a square-shaped column, but the terms are used interchangeably in translations) is called both a στῦλος and a κίων in Euripides. In Greek literature στῦλος is far the rarer word. κίων is Homeric, appearing, however, only in the *Odyssey*; both are found in inscriptions as well as, on less than a handful of occasions, in the other tragedians.[127] Galen (6. 544. 15 [Kühn]) and Pollux (1. 77. 7 [Bethe]) consider them to be synonyms, while a scholion at Pindar, *Olympian* 2. 146c (Drachmann) suggests that the terms should be distinguished.[128]

The metaphorical uses of columns and other supporting elements in Greek literature, as in Euripides, echo some of the themes already discussed in the "Walls" segment of the chapter. Both gods and mortals may be ennobled by comparison with an architectural column, whether Doric, Ionic, or Corinthian, always a model of grace, elegance, proportion, and strength. Thus in *h.Ap.* 8 Leto, who alone among the Olympians remains unintimidated at the approach of her son, Apollo, makes a point of hanging his bow from a golden peg on a (probably square, hence:) "pillar of his own father's [house]" (πρὸς κίονα πατρὸς ἑοῖο), a homey touch, but also a forceful reminder of the status of Apollo in that particular domicile. That a god (or a man) who merits such a comparison is endowed with physical beauty as well as singularity, self-sufficiency, and unending strength is also implied in the metaphor. Compare Pin-

---

[126] On the presence of columns on the Euripidean stage, see Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, pp. 25–28.

[127] LSJ, s. vv; cf. *TLG*. Examples of epigraphical appearances of στῦλος include *IG* IV^2 (1) 102 A 47, 63, 66, a fourth-century building inscription from the temple of Asclepius at Epidauros; for κίων, see *IG* I^3 474, II (col. I), e.g., 44, 48, 66, a building inscription of 409/8 BC from the Erechtheum; *IG* II^2 1668. 40; 1671. 4; 1675. 3, 31; 1679. 2; 1680. 1, fourth-century building inscriptions from Eleusis. στῦλος appears at A. *Ag.* 898, with metaphorical sense; κίων, at A. *Pr.* 349 (of Atlas' burden) and S. *Aj.* 108, 240.

[128] C.G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia* (Leipzig, 1821–1833); Erich Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon* (1900–1937; repr. Stuttgart, 1998); A.B. Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, 1: *Scholia in Olympionicas* (1903; repr. Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997). The schol. at Pi. *O.* 2. 146c reads: κίονα δὲ οὐ στύλον λέγει· ἀλλ' ἔστι παντὶ οἴκῳ τόπος στύλος λεγόμενος, ἐφ' οὗ κεῖνται οἱ πινσοὶ καὶ λέγεται ὅλην ἔχειν τὴν οἰκίαν.

dar's language at *O.* 8. 27, where Aegina, a "sea-girt land" (presumably a reminder of its status as an island nation) is called "a heavenly column" (κίονα δαιμονίαν) meant for the delectation of tourists, in recognition of its natural beauties. At *O.* 2. 6–7 Theron is both handsome and strong as the "pillar (ἔρεισμ') of Acragas (LSJ, s. v. i, 2)" and ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν ("the choicest city-supporting flower"), language which is echoed, in due course, and with perhaps unintentional irony, at vv. 81–82, when Hector, brought down by Achilles, is compared to an "unconquerable, steadfast column" (ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ κίονα). The trope "column = beauty and steadfast strength" is on occasion adopted and deployed, with a twist, by the tragedians, as well. At Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 897–898 Clytemnestra refers to her husband, in a torrent of false praise, as a "pillar of the house" (ὑψηλῆς στέγης / στῦλον ποδήρη); the king, of course, is about to fall at her hand, and the house of Atreus will again collapse in the cycle of murder and revenge that is reinvigorated with this act.[129]

Possibly under the influence of this striking Aeschylean image, in an extended metaphor in the prologue to *Iphigenia among the Taurians* (vv. 50–55), Euripides has Iphigenia relate a dream in which she witnesses a collapse of her father's house that leaves but a single column standing. That column, when it begins to assume various anthropomorphic qualities, she tearfully proceeds to douse with water, in fulfillment of the duties of her office as priestess to Artemis, as if it were someone destined to die (ὥς θανούμενον), consecrated by her as a Greek victim who happened to arrive at this foreign land (vv. 34–41).[130] Iphigenia immediately

---

[129] For further discussion of these and additional examples of columns as metaphors for humans in Greek literature, see Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 108, with n. 155, and the important discussion of Elizabeth P. McGowan, "Tomb Marker and Turning Post: Funerary Columns in the Archaic Period," *American Journal of Archaeology* 99 (1995), 615–632 (616–618), who associates the literary trope with actual depictions of columns on Archaic grave monuments. Rehm (loc. cit.) observes: "A single column in Greek art frequently stands for the house," and compares the single pillar flanked by lionesses in the relieving triangle of the Lions Gate at Mycenae, which, he suggests, citing the archaeological literature, "stands for the entire city." It is tempting also to compare such notions as are expressed here with the ancient Egyptian concept behind the official known as the Iunmutef (literally, "pillar of his mother") priest, "who symbolized the eldest son of the divine or royal family and who cared for the deceased king" (R.H. Wilkinson, *Reading Egyptian Art* [London, 1992], p. 25, with ill. 2, p. 24).

[130] As M.J. Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 2000), p. 177, points out, E. would have been familiar with both pillars and statues used as tomb markers in the Archaic period (on which see McGowan, "Tomb Marker and Turning Post"), a circumstance which "adds emotive depth to Iphigenia's impression that Orestes is dead."

associates the phenomenon with her absent brother, Orestes, aware, as she admits (v. 57), that "male children are the columns of the house (στῦλοι οἴκων)."[131] It is significant that, when we first encounter Orestes in *IT*, it is in the form of a column: στῦλος is the term used at *IT* 50 and 57 to refer both literally to the columns of Agamemnon's palace that are collapsing along with the roof and other superstructure in Iphigenia's dream, and metaphorically or symbolically to a family's sons, with Orestes, in this case, being the single remaining "column."

While the image of the constituent parts of Agamemnon's palace toppling in sequential order from the pinnacle of its roof to the ground is memorable, it remains a dream, but columns do collapse in real time in Euripides. At *Ba.* 591 κίων is the term used of the falling columns of the palace of Pentheus, as a divinely-induced earthquake allows Dionysos to break free of his "prison."[132] κίων is also the preferred term in *Heracles*, a drama in which the columns of Heracles' house play a salient role in the scene of the children's slaughter. One son seeks refuge either in the shadow of a column or within the perimeters of its profile, that is, *behind* the column (ὑπὸ κίονος σκιάν, v. 973), around which he is then pursued in circles to his death (v. 977), and Heracles, himself, felled against a column by a rock thrown by Athena (v. 1006), is bound to the column (v. 1011) or columns (v. 1038) to prevent further madness. At *HF* 1096 Heracles awakes, restored to sanity, to find himself tied to the "half-smashed" column (πρὸς ἡμιθραύστῳ λαΐνῳ τυκίσματι), whose condition now serves as an analogy with his present state.[133] While the direct comparison is with a tethered ship, Euripides is not above mixing metaphors, as we shall see presently with *Tr.* 118. There is, moreover, sufficient internal evidence to support the likelihood that Heracles identifies more with the broken column that he sees than the ship that he imagines, and that it should be read as the more urgent of the two references.[134]

---

131 Explained and quoted approvingly by Artem. *On.* 2. 10. 32–33 (Pack).

132 στῦλος also appears in a Bacchic context in fr. 203 (*Antiope*), where it may refer either to a column festooned with ivy (Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, pp. 281, and 308–309) or to a thyrsus; LSJ, s. v. i, 3 suggests "wooden pole."

133 Cf. Rehm, *The Play of Space*, pp. 100–101, with n. 123, comparing Odysseus tied to the mast in the Sirens episode and other column-bound figures in Greek literature and mythology, and p. 108. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 230, points out that Heracles does not even recognize his own courtyard or the bodies of his children beside him, neither questioning nor showing surprise that they are there.

134 Albeit, a nautical theme does persist throughout this play, though with less dramatic imperative than in *Tr.*; e.g., as is often pointed out, at *HF* 631–632 Heracles refers to his

The tone is set immediately in *Heracles*' prologue by Amphitryon, with its theme of homes inherited, preferred, exchanged, and usurped. As the messenger of the gods, Iris, alights via the machine on the roof of Heracles' house in Thebes, the setting for Euripides' drama, she announces to the fearful chorus of Theban elders that she and her companion deity, Lyssa, have mobilized (στρατεύομεν) not to harm the city, but to wreak havoc against one man's house (ἑνὸς δ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὸς δώματα, *HF* 825). As it is, the house and its manifold component parts, with particular emphasis on the columns, will constitute the setting for the tragedy to come and supply many of the play's metaphors. This is not to claim that emphasis on the house is a rarity in Greek tragedy; as Ruth Padel observes: "Tragedy uses the language of house persistently, both to signify the structures and values on which human relationships depend, and as an image for the self."[135] What is outstanding in this play is that its *physicality* is demonstrated over and over from beginning to end and that its constituent parts are featured both as important stage props and as suppliers of figurative language.[136] Knowing this, in retrospect, when the chorus at *HF* 637–641 lament old age as a tremendous burden, "heavier than the crags of Aetna," lying upon one's head (ἐπὶ κρατί), depriving the eyes of light, the image summoned to mind is of a stone caryatid bearing its impossible burden, the entablature and roof of a building, its forehead shaded by the surmounting capital and architrave.[137] That this is the intended allusion may gain support from Pindar, *Pythian* 1. 19–20, where "snowy Aetna" is called a "heavenly column" (κίων οὐρανία) that crushes the giant Typhon.[138]

Additional categories of supporting member are covered by the term σταθμός, in one of its diverse technical senses, referring to the standing, weight-bearing pillar or ridgepole of a roof.[139] Such usage follows a

---

children protectively as "little boats" which he leads into the palace, but it will be Heracles himself who is lead out at v. 1424 as a "little boat" in tow by a now much stronger man, Theseus.

[135] Ruth Padel, "Making Space Speak," in John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin, eds., *Nothing to Do With Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton, 1990), pp. 336–365 (349).

[136] For a perceptive discussion of the prominent role in *HF* of the architecture of Heracles' house, including the altar of Zeus Herkeios at which Megara and her sons seek refuge from Lycus, see Rehm, *The Play of Space*, pp. 100–113, esp. pp. 106–108.

[137] Cf. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 228, who also discusses the textual variations.

[138] Also mentioned in connection with the *HF* passage by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 151.

[139] A complex term; on its multiple meanings, see John Chadwick, *Lexigographica*

pattern of architectural terminology in Euripides similar to what we have seen before: frequent Homeric occurrences, especially in the *Odyssey*, a number of inscriptions, and otherwise quite rare.[140] In the plural, at *IT* 49, it is part of the concrete description of the destruction of the palace of Agamemnon dreamt by Iphigenia that also includes, as we have seen, στῦλοι at vv. 50 and 57. The entire roof lies on the ground, eerily, having fallen from its appropriate place at the peaks of the pillars or columns which once held it up; Euripides' language emphasizes the unnaturalness of the present inversion of the visible evidence of a properly functioning system of weight and support (βεβλημένον πρὸς οὖδας ἐξ ἄκρων σταθμῶν).[141] As the singular is more common when σταθμός should indicate "ridgepole," it seems the plural here could imply that the term is being used more generally as a synonym for στῦλοι to avoid diluting the suggestiveness of the word about to be used metaphorically of Orestes and generic "sons;" if that is the case it would function simply as a way of characterizing the great height (hence, ἄκρων) from which the roof has fallen and thus to enhance the dramatic impact of the abnormal sight of superstructure lying on the ground. Alternatively, this plural could refer to interior columns.[142] For comparable Euripidean scenes of roofs collapsed or collapsing, signifying that an entire, usually palatial, structure has fallen to the ground, both literally and with obvious symbolism, one may look to the imagery in *HF* 905–908, 1006–1008; *Ba*. 587–593, 602–603, 633; fr. 370. 49–54 (*Erec.*); and for a modern analogy, E.A. Poe's short story, "The Fall of the House of Usher."

The rare epithet περικίων (= "peristyled") all but belongs to Euripides; it is only known through its restoration at his fr. 369. 5 (*Erec.*) (Austin fr. 60) and at *IT* 405, the first, a reference to a temple of Athena, the

---

Graeca. Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek (Oxford, 1996), pp. 253–261.

[140] LSJ, s. v. ii. Epigraphical occurrences include *IG* II[2] 1672. 70, 173, a fourth-century BC building inscription from Eleusis; *IG* IV[2] (1) 103 B 94, a building inscription from Epidauros, also fourth-century.

[141] On the structure of Greek domestic roofs, both flat and gable, see Russell Meiggs, *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 191 and 207; A. Trevor Hodge, *The Woodwork of Greek Roofs* (Cambridge, Eng., 1960).

[142] Paley[2] 3, p. 349, shuns this usage altogether, preferring the more common meaning of σταθμός as "any sort of fixed abode." Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 64, suggests "bearing pillar of the roof," while acknowledging that this usage generally has the singular.

second, to the temple of Artemis.[143] The parallel περίστυλος is used at *Andr.* 1099 of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, and outside of Euripides in technical, historical or archaeological, and lexigraphical contexts; it does not occur in Homer, Pindar, or the other tragedians.[144] More interesting are the extremely rare terms εὐκίονες ("well-columned"), used in a choral passage at *Ion* 185 of the "halls of the gods" in Athens, and its parallel form, εὐστύλων, describing the temple of Artemis to which the chorus of *Iphigenia among the Taurians* process, having been summoned by their mistress, in their parodos at vv. 128–129. In the latter play the use of that particular adjective acquires especial significance in light of Iphigenia's dream, to which we may turn once more. Her attention now riveted on the surviving column, Iphigenia watches in fascination as the image grows more and more surreal, transforming itself into a simulacrum of her brother. When she relates that she witnessed Orestes' "tawny hair cascading down from the column's capital" (ἐκ δ' ἐπικράνων κόμας / ξανθὰς καθεῖναι, vv. 51–52), we realize that Euripides wishes us to picture a column of the Corinthian order, the most colossal of the classical orders and thus the most imposing, crowned with a capital of typically ornate acanthus-leaf decoration and perhaps gilded[145] that is now visually and metaphorically merged with Orestes' head framed by long, luxurious, blond hair.

[143] Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 185, adopting Elmsley's reading of *IT* 405, Grotius' of fr. 369. 5; cf. LSJ, s. v. A sch. at E. *Ph.* 651 relates an *aition* involving ivy and columns to explain a name of Dionysos used at Thebes, περικιόνιος.

[144] *TLG*, s. v. Pollux 1. 77. 7 (Bethe) again considers the terms synonyms: εἴποις δ' ἂν τὸν περίστυλον τόπον [καὶ] περικίονα—καὶ γὰρ στῦλος καὶ κίων ὀνομάζεται; in some mss., he then adds, interestingly, that among the Athenians the term is περίστῳον. The very rare ἀμφικίονας, used with ναούς at S. *Ant.* 285, might be compared.

[145] Werner Fuchs and Thorsten Opper, "Eine versteckte Huldigung des Euripides an Kallimachos, Bildhauer und Toreut (?)," in *Skenika. Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Horst-Dieter Blume*, Susanne Gödde and Theodor Heinze, eds. (Darmstadt, 2000), pp. 189–196 [hereafter cited as Fuchs/Opper] (193) argue, with some plausibility, that the columns at *IT* 128–129 are beautiful because they are gilded and Corinthian (see further below); although the authors overlook this passage, by implication, the present column might also follow suit, especially in light of the pointed reference to the coloration of Orestes' hair. Ralf Schenk, "Zur Bezeichnung 'Korinthisches Kapitell'," *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1996), 53–59, traces the history and significance of "Corinthian" as a designation for what would become the third Greek architectural order; among his conclusions are that, despite the aetiology that Vitruvius offers at 4. 1. 9–10 (on which, see below), the term arose in reference to the *material* out of which its capital was originally made, a costly bronze alloy associated with Corinth (p. 55). Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, p. 52, citing a

At this point all that is missing is speech, which the "column" acquires at v. 52. Literally, ἐπίκρανον is anything on the head; indeed at *Hipp*. 201 in the singular, it refers to a female head-dress.[146] As a term for an architectural member it is rare in literature, appearing, aside from this passage, in Pindar's fr. 33d. 7 and *I*. fr. 6b (d) (Snell and Maehler); it too is attested epigraphically.[147] Now a tantalizing discovery in 1981 at Vergina (Aigai) of a funerary inscription from the turn of the fifth and fourth centuries BC may help to pull all of this together.[148] It contains a fragmentary verse most likely in the form of an elegiac couplet in which occurs the phrase

---

suggestion by "Murray," with no further reference, observes that the ξάνθ' of *IT* 73 is "obviously" meant to recall the imagery of Iphigenia's dream; if so, it would seem a senselessly morbid analogy.

[146] W.S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos* (1964; repr. Oxford, 1992), p. 200; cf. Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 64; Michael R. Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytus* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 2000), p. 169, observes that it can also be used as an architectural term for "a type of capital." However, Eust. 700. 64 (Van der Valk), in citing *Hipp*. 201 as an exceptional use, appears to suggest that the architectural application of the term is primary: ἐπίκρανον. ὅπερ ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ κίονος, καὶ κατ' Εὐριπίδην, κρήδεμνον, εἰπόντα ἐπίκρανον κεφαλῆς; the first part of this passage is cited by Platnauer, op. cit., p. 64, discussing *IT* 51, in support of his ἐπίκρανον = κιονόκρανον. A related technical architectural term, ἐπικρανῖτις, was used to refer to a wall capital or an interior cornice; see D.S. Robertson, *Handbook*, p. 381, s. v. "Capital," and William Bell Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece* (New York, 1975), p. 391, for the definition.

[147] LSJ, s. v. ii; cf. *TLG*, s. v. Epigraphical occurrences include *IG* II^2 1666 A 77, 89; 1668. 43, 44; 1672. 185; 1679. 2, 1680. 1, fourth-century building inscriptions from Eleusis; *IG* I^3 386 (col. II) 89, also from Eleusis, 408/7 BC.

[148] Ed. pr., Chryssoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, "NAVN EUSTULVN. A Fragmentary Inscription of the Classical Period from Vergina," in *Inscriptions of Macedonia* (Third International Symposium on Macedonia, Thessaloniki, 8–12 December 1993) (Thessaloniki, 1996), pp. 100–122 [hereafter cited as Saatsoglou-Paliadeli] (105) = *SEG* 46 (1996), p. 830. A more extensive discussion of this inscription and its potential significance in the life and career of E., portions of which are reiterated here, may be found in my own "Further Thoughts on εὔστυλος in Euripides' *IT*, Vitruvius, and a Late Fifth-Century BC. Inscription from Vergina (*SEG* 46 (1996) 830)," *Philologus* 150 (2006), 28–37. For the circumstances of the discovery and the date of the inscription, see Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, pp. 101 and 107, with figs. 1–3. Note that the epigram is not an inscription honoring the burial in which it was found, but merely appears on a block evidently re-used in the construction of the later tomb. According to the author (op. cit., p. 101) the cist tomb had been excavated in 1961 and reported in the *Archaeologikon Deltion* of 1961–1962 (Ph.M. Petsas, "'Ανασκαφὴ ἀρχαίου νεκροταφείου Βεργίνης [1960–1961]," *Archaeologikon Deltion* 17 [1961–1962], 218–288 [218]), but it was twenty years later that remnants of an inscription were noticed on a sandstone block that had been used in the construction of the east side of the tomb. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 103, deduced that the preserved block contains the left portion of an inscription that was continued on the face of an adjacent block, which thus far has not been found on site. The construction of the monument and the nature of the inscription, the author adds, make it clear that "the inscribed piece was originally the leftmost section of the base of a grave-marker."

ναῶν εὐστύλων, the identical language, transposed, of *IT* 128–129, a play traditionally dated ca. 413.[149] The inscription, and, consequently, the tomb which it originally marked, have convincingly been associated with the late-fifth century sculptor, metal worker, painter ("hunc quidem et pictorem fuisse tradunt," Pliny 34. 92), and architect, Kallimachos, whose name has been restored by the publisher of the *editio princeps*, Chryssoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli; the appearance of the word τέχνη, unusual in funerary inscriptions, would seem to confirm the reading.[150] Since there was a solid tradition in antiquity that Euripides ended his life at the court of Archelaos in Macedonia at the end of the fifth century, and, as it now seems, Kallimachos died there around the same time, the epigram might conceivably be attributed to the tragedian's hand—an intriguing possibility.[151] We can ascertain neither when the poet arrived at the court nor when he died, although the date 408 BC is generally accepted for the former, and 406 for the latter, based primarily upon the production of Ar. *Ra.* at the Lenaea of January/February 405, which presumes the playwright's recent death. While Saatsoglou-Paliadeli appears to favor a date for the epitaph somewhere in the vicinity of 408–406 based upon similarities to other inscriptions, she ultimately settles on "turn of the fifth century BC" because of the presence of the post-Euclidian script, that is, the Ionic alphabet that was prescribed for official documents in Attica in the archonship of Euclides (403/2).[152] But such caution would seem

[149] For the meter, see Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 107 (cf. *SEG* 46 [1996] p. 830); for the date of *IT*, see Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, pp. xiv–xvi.

[150] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, pp. 109 and 113, with n. 49, who cites no evidence other than "Peek" for the latter claim; I was able to find a form of τέχνη in only two inscriptions from *CEG*, no. 230 and restored in no. 192. For a convenient overview of the ancient sources for Kallimachos, see Andrew F. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration*, 2 vols. (New Haven and London, 1990), pp. 271–272. In an article on "Kallimachos" in Rainer Vollkommer and Doris Vollkommer-Glökler, eds., *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, 1 (Leipzig, 2001), pp. 393–396, H. Büsing doubts that all of the ancient testimonia about this evidently multi-skilled artisan refer to the same person; the present inscription, however, which might have affected his argument, is not discussed. This is not the place to challenge Büsing's conclusions; suffice it to point out that the phenomenon of the "Renaissance" man is not restricted to fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italy.

[151] Scott Scullion, "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the *Frogs*," *Classical Quarterly* 53 (2003), 389–400, argues, primarily from an absence of references in Ar. *Ra.*, that E.'s exile and death at the court of Archelaos is a fiction. However, while Scullion mounts a formidable case from circumstantial evidence, in my view, the *argumentum ex silentio* in *Ra.* is ultimately not convincing. The later testimonia are simply too numerous and consistent to be dismissed; see, e.g., *TrGF* 5. 1, T A1. IA, 10 and II; A 2–4; C 15b and 17a; K b 79–82; P 112–120; Q 121–123, 125c, and 126.

[152] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 107.

unnecessary, as we are dealing with a private inscription produced outside of Athens. Moreover, scholars of ancient Greek scripts allow for exceptions to this general *TPQ*.[153] On balance the mere presence of Ionic letter forms need not be viewed as probative for the lower date.

Our concerns at this time are with how the new inscription bears upon Euripides' use of rare, technical-sounding language at *IT* 128–129 (and, by association, at *Ion* 185) and his apparent interest in a specific order of architecture in the prologue. Now it may not be a coincidence that the very same Kallimachos who is apparently honored in this epitaph is credited with the "invention" of the Corinthian order by Vitruvius (4. 1. 9–10), although "discovery" might actually be more accurate, if the Roman's story is to be believed. The colorful *aition* involves a basket, a tile, and an acanthus plant, which, over a period of time, aided by the forces of gravity, fortuitously dispose themselves atop the grave monument of an unnamed Corinthian maiden until Kallimachos happens by the tomb and is taken with the "genere et formae novitate" of the accidental arrangement. In response he "makes columns for the Corinthians" from which he then works out the full details of the order. It makes perfect sense that Kallimachos, who earned the nickname κατατηξίτεχνος (Pliny 34. 92; Paus. 1. 26. 7) on account of the "fussiness" of his workmanship, invents the Corinthian, certainly the most "fussy" of the classical orders. The early Corinthian order, it should be noted in passing, has a singular affiliation with the Athenian acropolis of Euripides' day. A lone Corinthian column, long assumed to be the first of its type, appears, for reasons unknown, in a prominent, centralized location in the interior of the temple of Apollo at Bassai, a later work by one of the Parthenon's own architects, Iktinos.[154] In part because of this connection, four Corinthian, rather than the usually accepted, Ionic, columns have been restored in the mysterious west

---

153 A.G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions* (Cambridge, Eng., 1959), pp. 18–19, with examples in n. 11, points out: "Earlier in the fifth century Ionic usages had occasionally intruded into official as well as private inscriptions"; Henry R. Immerwahr, *Attic Script. A Survey* (Oxford, 1990) p. 179, assumes the gradual infiltration of the Ionic alphabet into "informal" Attic inscriptions from the end of the sixth century onwards. Furthermore, as Woodhead, op. cit., p. 19, observes: "No such fixed date for the adoption of the Ionic alphabet exists in the case of other cities or areas."

154 Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, pp. 157–158; Fuchs/Opper, p. 193, with n. 15, suggest that the column was singled out for its gilded capital, a phenomenon which, in their view, was explicitly associated with the newly invented order.

room of the Parthenon (i.e., the "Parthenon," proper).[155] As well, a column of the Corinthian order is often restored under the right hand of the Parthenos.[156] All of this implies a special connection between Kallimachos, his new architectural order, and later fifth-century Athens and suggests a context for Euripides' unusual choice of language.

One might be forgiven for assuming, at first glance, that, since the adjective εὔστυλος at *IT* 128 occurs in a choral passage, it is simply an epicism or a lyricism meant to convey in succinct, epithet-like form a generic sense of architectural beauty.[157] As it turns out, however, εὔστυλος is "strikingly rare" in ancient literature, as Saatsoglou-Paliadeli puts it; outside of *IT*, it is documented but once, and that in a Latin rather than a Greek author, as a technical architectural term in our only preserved ancient architect's treatise, that again of Vitruvius, who helpfully provides a definition (3. 3. 1).[158] A "eustyle" temple, unlike a "pycnostyle," which has columns too close together, and "systyle," "diastyle," and "araeostyle," buildings, in each of which the columns are incrementally too far apart, has a "just distribution" of intercolumniations, the attainment of which Vitruvius then goes on to explain at length, both in theory and in practice (3. 3. 6–9). Saatsoglou-Paliadeli makes a forceful case stronger by introducing the evidence of *IT* 128–129 in support of the argument that the proportions and aesthetic of the *eustyle* temple, long assumed, on Vitruvius' authority (3. 3. 9), to have been invented by the Hellenistic architect, Hermogenes, were already known in the late-fifth century BC.[159] Thus (to risk a somewhat circular argument) the presence of the term in Kallimachos' epigram both supports the suggested date of late-fifth century for the inscription, as Saatsoglou-Paliadeli observes, and connects, if only by a thread, the *eustyle* temple specifically with Kallimachos.[160]

---

[155] Poul Pedersen, *The Parthenon and the Origin of the Corinthian Capital*, (Odense University Classical Studies) 13 (Odense, 1989), followed by Fuchs/Opper, pp. 193–195.

[156] Neda Leipen, *Athena Parthenos. A Reconstruction* (Toronto, 1971), frontispiece and fig. 60, with pp. 36–40, esp. 38; the primary evidence for the existence of a supporting column on the original is the Varvakeion statuette; cf. Fuchs/Opper, p. 195, with n. 21.

[157] Cf. Fuchs/Opper, p. 192: "Der Terminus εὔστυλος mag zunächst als recht konventionelles Beiwort zur Charakterisierung eines Tempels erscheinen, ist dies jedoch keineswegs."

[158] *TLG*, s. v.; Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, pp. 109 and 111; Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 85: "εὐστύλων is hapax." Similarly, εὐκίων appears only at *Ion* 185 and on two occasions in the *AP*, an epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (Gow and Page 10, v. 7 = *AP* 7. 648), and *AP* 9. 697 (Paton, *The Greek Anthology*, 3).

[159] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, pp. 111 and 113, with earlier references.

[160] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, pp. 111 and 115.

But how did Euripides know of it? It is not out of the question that he might have encountered Kallimachos in person at the cultured court of Archelaos, where the artisan may have sojourned for a brief period at the end of the fifth/early fourth centuries, as Saatsoglou-Paliadeli has plausibly proposed,[161] and thereby could have become aware of the term εὔστυλος as a professional architect's designation for a particular category of peripteral building whose proportions represent aesthetic and functional perfection. It is also not out of the question that the tragedian encountered the artisan in Athens, as the latter was working on another "fussy" work of art, the golden chimney lamp surmounted by a palm tree for the Erechtheum, whose description by Pausanias (1. 26. 6–7) sounds, not by chance, perhaps, vaguely reminiscent of the form of the Corinthian capital.[162] So, too, Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, who points to the series of neo-Attic "dancing-maenad" reliefs, which have long been associated with Kallimachos primarily on stylistic grounds based on information gleaned from literary sources and an analogous group of "Laconian Dancers" (saltantes Lacaenae) attributed to the master by Pliny (34. 92), which have been identified in a second set of reliefs.[163]

---

[161] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 115, who adds, with caution, that if Kallimachos is indeed the subject of the Vergina inscription, death and burial at Aigai, at least, are implied. Admittedly, the window of opportunity for the two to have met there is slight, sometime between E.'s arrival ca. 408 and death in the spring (?) of 406. On Saatsoglou-Paliadeli's reckoning (p. 115), Kallimachos' sojourn at the court would most likely have occurred sometime between 403 and 399, and therefore she does not suggest that the two met. However, an opportunity would seem to have been available in the brief interval between the completion of Kallimachos' major project in Athens, an elaborate lamp for the Erechtheum (see below), and the presumed date of E.'s death. Fuchs/Opper, p. 191, appear to leave open the possibility of a meeting at the Macedonian court, but in considering *IT* 128–129 an act of "veiled homage" ("Eine versteckte Huldigung," title and p. 196) paid to Kallimachos by E., and in arguing for an earlier beginning to Kallimachos' Athenian career (the main focus of their paper; see p. 196 and passim), they imply an earlier acquaintance of some sort in Athens.

[162] Olga Palagia, "A Niche for Kallimachos' Lamp?," *American Journal of Archaeology* 88 (1984), 515–521, discusses this artifact and suggests a plausible location in the preserved remains of the Erechtheum; for a more recent treatment, see Eva Parisinou, *The Light of the Gods. The Role of Light in Archaic and Classical Greek Cult* (London, 2000), pp. 20–31.

[163] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 115, with n. 57. On the two sets of reliefs and their likely association with Kallimachos: Martin Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge, Eng., 1975), pp. 405–406; John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture. The Classical Period* (London, 1985), (hereafter cited as Boardman, *GSC*), p. 207 and figs. 242–243; Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, pp. 271–272; and especially Werner Fuchs, *Die Vorbilder der neuattischen Reliefs* (Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Ergänzungsheft) 20 (Berlin, 1959), pp. 72–96, who reconstructs the originals of both monuments (figs. 1 and 2) and attributes them to Kallimachos.

Werner Fuchs, however, in a position reiterated after having become aware of the Vergina inscription, has boldly and convincingly associated the maenadic dancers with a choregic monument erected in Athens to honor Euripides' posthumous victory with *Bacchae*, thought to have been written ca. 408–406 BC at the court of Archelaos and produced for the first time by Euripides the younger in Athens in the spring of 405.[164] If this attribution is correct, it begins to suggest, according to Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, "an indirect connection between Callimachus and Euripides in Athens" during these years.[165] Perhaps Euripides had met Kallimachos before he left for Macedonia and discussed the term "eustyle" and its rationale with him or read about it in a treatise that is now lost to us; Euripides, it will be recalled, was both celebrated and criticized for being an omnivorous reader and intellectual. If so, then it is also likely that he was aware of Kallimachos' reputation for inventing the Corinthian order.

It is even possible, according to a recent argument put forward by Fuchs and Thorsten Opper which was inspired by the publication of the Vergina inscription, that in Euripides' day, εὔστυλος had nothing to do with intercolumniations but rather served as the name for the new order;[166] in that case the two achievements would be credibly combined. The authors regard the new evidence of a connection between *IT* 128–129, Kallimachos, and the *eustyle* temple somewhat differently than does Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, preferring to disassociate the term and the concept from both Vitruvius and Hermogenes, and go on to consider at great length the question of what might have made a temple "beautiful-columned" in the second half of the fifth century BC.[167] They miss, however, two important pieces of evidence that would have supported their argument: the allusion to what I believe to be the Corinthian order in the prologue to *IT* and the variation εὐκίονες at *Ion* 185, which need not have any connection with Vitruvius' term "eustyle" and is thereby freed up as possibly another descriptive synonym for the new, "beautiful" order of architecture. For the present purposes, however, it matters less whether the fifth-century aesthetic was the same or different from that presented by Vitruvius than that Euripides uses a rare *terminus technicus* with such

---

[164] Fuchs, *Die Vorbilder*, pp. 90–91, reiterated in Fuchs/Opper, pp. 191–192.

[165] Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 115.

[166] Fuchs/Opper, pp. 192–196, who point out (p. 193, with n. 11) that the term "Corinthian" is first attested in the early Hellenistic period.

[167] Fuchs/Opper, esp. pp. 192–193.

evident finesse.[168] Regardless of whether Euripides knew Kallimachos, or simply knew of him, interest in the artisan's work and its theoretical underpinnings[169] could explain both the bold choice of a Corinthian column in Iphigenia's dream in the prologue of *IT* and the use of a rare, technically accurate term for an ideally proportioned (Corinthian?) colonnade in a choral evocation of the beauty of a peripteral temple in that same play, not to mention its synonym εὐκίονες at *Ion* 185. And, conversely, Kallimachos' interest in and familiarity with the plays of Euripides or, quite possibly, an acquaintance with the playwright himself, could account for the Euripidean language of the epitaph.[170]

Superstructures

As the chorus of *Iphigenia among the Taurians* make their gentle way toward the temple of Artemis singing of the walls, towers, and physical landscapes of their past and present homes, they note not only that its colonnade is lovely and well-spaced but that it is surmounted by a "gilded architrave" (χρυσήρεις θριγκούς, v. 129). As tempted as I am to follow Fuchs and Opper in interpreting χρυσήρεις θριγκούς at *IT* 129 as an "Umschreibung ... für goldgefügte Kapitelle" on the argument that the terminology for 'capital' was varied and relatively vague at this time,[171] I cannot see θριγκός as other than a correct and specific technical reference to the architrave, cornice, or overall

[168] For another possible example of a reflection of developments in contemporary architecture in a tragedian, cf. A. *Supp.* 961: μονορρύθμους δόμους. LSJ, s. v., μονόρρυθμος, has, incongruously, "dwelt in by one only." Wolfgang Rösler, "Typenhäuser bei Aischylos?," in *Demokratie und Architektur. Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie*, eds. Wolfgang Schuller, Wolfram Hoepfner, and Ernst Ludwig Schwandner (Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Architekturreferat, Wohnen in der klassischen Polis) 2 (Munich, 1989), pp. 109–112, prefers to interpret the hapax as a rather literal reference to the uniform appearance of private houses built on the Hippodamian model under the evolving democracy. However, I wonder whether the term might be an architectural *terminus technicus* and, as such, more likely an erudite reference to the proportions, columnar pattern, or some other more rarified aesthetic quality of a specific building type.

[169] Cf. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 111, with references: "Even if one considers that the phrase ναῶν εὐστύλων in the Vergina inscription is simply taken directly from Euripides, it is very likely that, as was his wont, Euripides himself was actually alluding to a term that had already been discussed as a *terminus technicus* in his own time; a time, that is, of vigorous theoretical inquiry among artists ...".

[170] Cf. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, p. 111; *SEG* 46 (1996) p. 830: "for the use of the rare epithet εὔστυλος the poet was probably inspired by Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 128/129."

[171] Fuchs/Opper, p. 191, n. 6, for which they cite Schenk, "Zur Bezeichnung," p. 57.

superstructure, to judge from his use of the term elsewhere (see below), particularly since Euripides does have at his disposal and deploys a perfectly good word for 'capital', ἐπίκρανον, at *IT* 51. However, it is curious and potentially significant that, according to William St. Clair and Robert Picken, in a hitherto unknown French manuscript recording a visit to Athens in 1699, not long after the disastrous explosion of 1687 which destroyed much of the central portion of the Parthenon, the author claimed of its columns: "Elles estoient toutes dorées par les chapiteaux."[172] St. Clair and Picken, however, observing that "this is a strange remark," conclude unconvincingly that it is a metonymic reference to the *polychromy* of "the whole pediment," in spite of the fact that the text immediately following the remark apparently itemizes the capitals by quantity and precise location.[173] While it is tantalizing to think of possible real-life parallels, at any rate, gilded temple components are not unknown as images in literature; compare Pi. *O.* 6. 1–2 (columns) and fr. 194 (Snell and Maehler) (*krêpis* or stylobate; i.e., floor). Thinking more pragmatically, Kyriakou, in reference to *IT* 129, suggests: "The reference to the gilded copings ... of the temple serves to single out or, more likely, to suggest to the audience a feature of the stage-building."[174]

As we turn our attention from the language of foundations and supporting members to the language of superstructures, another wide field of semantic and metaphorical potential is exposed and, once again, we may turn to *Trojan Women* for illustration. Hecuba, at *Tr.* 489, chooses the same word, θριγκός, to serve as a metaphor for the final act of degradation that she must endure, enslavement in old age to the Greek household of her enemy, Odysseus, an outcome that she understandably considers the "finishing touch" of her suffering. It is an apt metaphor. The technical term for the topmost course of stone in a wall, otherwise known as the "coping" or finishing course, and, by extension the entablature of a temple and/or its cornices, θριγκός is sprinkled liberally throughout Euripides but, in a familiar pattern, seldom occurs elsewhere in

[172] William St. Clair and Robert Picken, "The Parthenon in 1687: New Sources," in *The Parthenon and Its Sculptures*, ed. Michael B. Cosmopoulos (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), pp. 166–195 (174, 181, and 187).

[173] St. Clair and Picken, "The Parthenon in 1687," pp. 174, 181 and 187; see the review of St. Clair and Picken by Mary B. Hollinshead, *American Journal of Archaeology* 110 (2006), 328, for further commentary and references.

[174] Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 85.

literature and yet is paralleled in building inscriptions.[175] The term is not especially Homeric, occurring only at *Od.* 7. 87; 17. 267, and in verbal form at *Od.* 14. 10. θριγκόω is used with metaphorical sense at A. *Ag.* 1283 (κάτεισιν ἄτας τάσδε θριγκώσων φίλοις), a passage which, according to some commentators, influenced Euripides; the latter, however, uses the term with much greater frequency.[176] The term occurs only once in extant Sophocles, in its nominal form, in fr. 506 (*Poimenes*), where it is used literally to refer to the finishing course of Troy's fallen walls.

The verbal form appears at *HF* 1280, where Heracles admits to "capping with a finishing course" or "building an entablature over" (θριγκῶσαι) his house with the act of killing his children.[177] With architecture in *Heracles*, much like *Trojan Women*, but on a domestic scale, the metaphorical and the literal coexist; this is made clearest at vv. 904–909, where Lyssa produces the earthquake that shakes the house of Heracles and causes the roof to collapse, with both literal and symbolic connotations, as the hero enters to perform the dreadful deed that constitutes his divine punishment. While it is clear that Euripides finds great favor with the term, *Tr.* 489 and *HF* 1280 mark the only occurrences in the corpus of θριγκός and cognates with metaphorical sense. In the remaining cases the term demands a literal interpretation, which suggests that Euripides' rare metaphorical uses spring rather from his familiarity with and interest in the term in its technical sense rather than the other way around.

It is well to review Euripides' use of this by no means common word and its compounds.[178] The term appears repeatedly and in circumstances of greatest drama in *IT*. At *IT* 47, in relating the dream discussed at length above, Iphigenia describes her father's house collapsing in front

---

[175] E.g., *SIG* 244 ii. 61, a building inscription from fourth-century BC Delphi, where it refers to the backing blocks situated behind the Doric frieze; *IG* VII 3073. 68, a Hellenistic building contract from Lebadeia.

[176] Eduard Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, 3 (1950; repr. Oxford, 1962), pp. 596–597, citing "Blomfield" (C.J. Blomfield, *Aeschyli Agamemnon* [1823; 5th ed. London, 1839], p. 290?). Other commentators on *Ag.* are in the habit of noting the term's frequent appearances in E., as, e.g., Thomas W. Peile, *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (London, 1844), p. 287, who also cites Blomfield, but without attributing any influence from A.

[177] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 386, translating "the coping at the edge of the roof," calls this a "rare and striking metaphor" and, following Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 265, suggests that it may be an "echo" of *Ag.* 1283; Barlow. *Euripides Heracles*, p. 178, on the other hand, simply makes the comparison.

[178] Cf. the brief overview of Isabelle Torrance, "Euripides' *IT* 72–75 and a *Skene* of Slaughter," *Hermes* 137 (2009), 21–27 (22–23).

of her eyes, from top to bottom, beginning with the θριγκός; here, the term likely refers to the entire entablature with its triglyph and metope frieze, just beneath the horizontal cornice of the roof. At the temple of Artemis, Orestes and Pylades observe, hanging from the θριγκοῖς, bloody spoils, likely skulls and their residue, taken by the Taureans from foreign enemies, some of them Greek (*IT* 74–75).[179] These are probably hung at cornice level. Meanwhile, blood from slaughtered Greeks has stained yellow the cornice, or crown molding (θριγκώματα) of the altar (βωμός) where these sacrifices are conducted (*IT* 72–73).[180] Though there is disagreement among interpreters of the scene, the sequence is clear: First the two men eye the temple precinct (μέλαθρα ταῦτ' θεᾶς, *IT* 69), then they spot the blood-stained altar where the sacrifices took place (vv. 72–73), and finally they identify the tangible results displayed hanging from the horizontal cornices of the temple (v. 74).

At *Hel.* 70 the imposing palace of the King of Egypt has εὔθριγκοι ... ἕδραι, which implies that its walls are carefully wrought and finished and, again at v. 430, Menelaus has seen and been impressed, apparently from some distance, that its walls are surmounted by a finishing course all round. Ion is inveighing against the birds that might consider building

[179] There is considerable disagreement concerning what these σκῦλα represent, whether skulls, severed heads, or other personal spoils, and where exactly they are placed either on the temple or the altar. Paley^2 3, p. 351, citing Hdt. 4. 103 as the *locus classicus* on the practice among the Taurians, opts for skulls. Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 66, assumes that the spoils are "doubtless the severed heads of the victims," attached somehow to the altar. The most recent to treat the passage, Torrance, "Euripides' *IT* 72–75" (with additional bibliography), concludes in favor of human skulls affixed to the temple, with blood running symbolically down the columns. Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 70, prefers to regard them as personal possessions, such as clothes or arms, of the victims, noting the reference to cremation of victims at *IT* 625–626, and arguing that "the practice of hanging skulls from altars is not attested for Taurians in any source." Regarding the staging, Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, p. 53, suggests the following: "A row of masks fixed along the upper part of the façade would enhance the atmosphere of exotic horror that the poet so carefully prepares from the very beginning of the play." Torrance, op. cit., pp. 26–27, emphasizes the gruesomeness of the scene.

[180] If Ruhnken's emendation θριγκώματα is to be read in preference to τριχώματα of the ms.; Diggle, Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4, and Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia*, have the former, Murray, *Euripidis Fabulae*, 2, the latter; for a fuller account of the critical reception of the emendation, see Torrance, "Euripides' *IT* 72–75," p. 21, with n. 2, who argues in defense of the ms. reading. Among the objections that Torrance brings to her case is the proximity of θριγκώματα (used of the altar) and θριγκοῖς (used of the temple) at *IT* 74; she suggests that the image is of an altar "veined" with blood, a medical reading of τριχώματα. See also the commentaries of Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 66; Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 179; Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, pp. 70–71.

nests beneath the cornice or eaves of Apollo's temple at *Ion* 156 (θριγκοῖς) and 171 (ὑπὸ θριγκούς). More resistant of interpretation is *Ion* 1321, where the priestess of Apollo has left the θριγκούς; this could be a synecdoche either for the temple or the adyton, of which we know precious little.[181] Rather than speculate further about which architectural feature is the intended referent in this instance, it is enough to note that it is another Euripidean occurrence of a rare word. Finally, Orestes, on the roof of his own house, threatens to smash Menelaus' head τῷδε θριγκῷ at *Or.* 1569; the roof and the λάινοι … θριγκοί of that same house cry out at Agamemnon's death at *El.* 1150–1151. This brief overview suggests that there is little need to look to Aeschylus for a source for the metaphorical use of the term at *Tr.* 489. For Euripides—unlike his predecessor, who apparently used the term sparingly—has established his credentials, so to speak, regarding the literal, technical meaning of θριγκός; thus, when it turns up as metaphor, the term is all the more effective as an image that, as it were, acknowledges whence it came. That a rare metaphorical use of this term occurs in *Trojan Women* is not surprising; regarding the language of architecture, there is no such thing as coincidence, and the literal meanings of words are never entirely subsumed. Given the role of architecture in the play, the image just barely qualifies as a metaphor.

Related to, and sometimes confused with, θριγκός, but narrower in its use, is γεῖσον,[182] another architectural term that appears in inscriptions, in Euripides (at least four times), and otherwise only rarely and in later, technical sources.[183] In the singular it is equivalent to cornice, that is, the projecting parts of the roof, both horizontal, which extends all the way

[181] Murray has it in the gen. sing.; Verrall, *The Ion of Euripides*, p. 108, suggests "a low wall running around the ἄδυτον and serving to preserve it from intrusion"; A.S. Owen, *Euripides Ion* (Oxford, 1939), p. 161, echoes the viewpoint of Verrall, as does Lee, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 298–299. Winnington-Ingram, "The Delphic temple," p. 499, argues that, since such a barrier would not be visible from the outside, even if one were standing on the stylobate, the present action must be conceived as taking place *inside* the temple.

[182] Schol. E. *Or.* 1569: θριγκῷ: θριγκοὶ καλοῦνται οἱ ἐπικείμενοι λίθοι ταῖς ἐξοχαῖς τῶν δωμάτων. τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ καὶ γεῖσα; cf. schol. *Tr.* 489.

[183] LSJ, s. v., cf. *TLG*, s. v. The term occurs in extant poetry only in E., although it has been conjectured at S. *OT* 876 by Wolff, followed by many editors, but rejected solidly by J.C. Kamerbeek, *The Plays of Sophocles*. Pt. 4: *The Oedipus Tyrannus* (Leiden, 1967), p, 176; otherwise, it is relatively rare, with its occurrences limited almost exclusively to scholia to E. and lexica. Epigraphical appearances include *IG* I^3 474 (col. II) 187, a building inscription of 409/8 BC from the Erechtheum; *IG* II^2 1666 B 9, and restored with a high degree of certainty at A 45, 54, B. 2; 1668. 30, 34, 38, 39, fourth-century building inscriptions from Eleusis; and *IG* II^2 463. 51, of 307/6 BC, from Athens.

around the building, and raking (that is, at an angle), which appears at the ends only. In inscriptions the plural may also refer to the individual blocks of both cornices.[184] It is easy to understand how, in Euripides, the term might be used to allude in a general sense to the entire roof, of which only the portion of the cornice that is called the sima, however, is actually a part.[185] At *Ph.* 1157–1158 the Theban Periclymenus, Poseidon's son, grabs a geison block that weighs as much as a wagon's load (ἁμαξοπληθῆ) and hurls it down upon one of the Seven, Atalanta's son, Parthenopaeus, killing him.[186] Most likely he pushes the block down from its perch in the horizontal cornice atop the wall. A moment later at *Ph.* 1180 we hear that Capaneus met his fate at this very location, the horizontal cornice at the top of the wall (γεῖσα τειχέων) which he was just about to surmount when he was struck down by the lightning bolt of Zeus.

Orestes finds himself in a similar position on the roof of his father's palace at *Or.* 1570. As he confronts Menelaus who is standing below, Orestes threatens him with a geison block seized from the venerable roof (παλαιὰ γεῖσα) if Menelaus attempts to enter the building with the intent to save his and Helen's daughter, Hermione. In the plural, here, γεῖσα is more likely to refer to the entire horizontal cornice, while a single cornice block is more likely intended by τῷδε θριγκῷ of v. 1569—not perfectly felicitous phraseology, but clear enough. Scholia at *Or.* 1569 and 1570 define θριγκοί as "the stones lying upon the extremities (ταῖς ἐξοχαῖς) of houses," and γεῖσα as "the crowns of the house," while noting that the two terms are interchangeable.[187] J. Jannoray, who introduces *Or.* 1569–1570 and other relevant Euripidean passages into a discussion of the distinctions between γεῖσον and θριγκός in a building inscription

---

[184] LSJ, s. v. i, 1; D. Robertson, *Handbook*, p. 382, s. v. Cornice, who cites a fourth-century BC building inscription from Eleusis (*IG* II^2 1666 A 54–55 [partially restored] and B. 9), where the blocks of the horizontal cornice are called γεῖσα Δωρικά, while those of the raking cornice are called γεῖσα Ἰωνικά, presumably, according to Robertson, because the latter lack mutules; cf. Lacey D. Caskey, "Notes on Inscriptions from Eleusis Dealing with the Building of the Porch of Philon," *American Journal of Archaeology* 9 (1905), 147–156 (153), with earlier references.

[185] See D. Robertson, *Handbook*, p. 382, s. v. Cornice, and Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 72, with fig. 98.

[186] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 473, notes that ἁμαξοπληθῆ is documented in only three places, one of which, Lucian *VH* 1. 41 (where the missiles are oysters), is a "burlesque imitation" of *Ph.* 1157–1158. Mastronarde suggests further that "perhaps the word was current in the construction trade to describe the largest stone capable of being carried in a wagon," comparable to "Homeric stones that not even two men … could lift" at, e.g., *Il.* 12. 380–385 and 12. 445–460.

[187] See note 182, above.

from Lebadeia, sees the location as a kind of terraced wall of the sort "que nous fait connaître la tradition épique," rather than a "roof" proper; noting that it will eventually be set afire, Jannoray also suggests that these ϑριγκοί would have to be made of wood, and, considering the adjective modifying γεῖσα, παλαιά, followed by τεκτόνων πόνον, suspects that it may have been highly ornamented: "habille d'un revêtement métallique ou orné d'une frise en matière vitreuse."[188] While my interpretation differs somewhat, these attempts, early and late, to respect the distinctions in technical application intended by Euripides' adoption of both terms in this descriptive passage are instructive.

Orestes orders Pylades to set fire to the γεῖσα at *Or.* 1620. C.W. Willink considers the possibility that Euripides meant to distinguish the γεῖσα at v. 1570 as a reference to "this parapet" and the γεῖσα at v. 1620 as a reference to the "roof," which is set afire.[189] The distinction, however, seems unnecessary. Stone also burns, especially since these blocks would have been in close proximity to the wooden beams of the actual roof. A.W. Lawrence, in his classic study of Greek architecture, observes that "wood always remained the normal material for ceilings, in spite of the risk of fire."[190] Furthermore, in the Classical period general knowledge that fine and important buildings were made of wood and mud brick before they were made of stone could have given rise to some misconceptions about which members were constructed out of which material and when the transition to stone occurred in the history of each individual member. In other words, there may have been some confusion about what was wood and what was stone in early buildings.

There may be a further implication in Orestes' language at *Or.* 1570, when he characterizes the cornice (γεῖσα) of his father's ancestral palace as παλαιά and as a τεκτόνων πόνον. Finding himself on the roof in exceptional circumstances, Orestes is able to observe close at hand, perhaps for the first time, the craftsmanship of the individual blocks that form the cornice. Orestes notes almost wistfully that the blocks are the product of the labor of craftsmen (τεκτόνων πόνον) from an earlier era (παλαιά); it seems that only if he reaches a state of forced desperation will he allow himself to break up the revered cornice. One might argue

[188] J. Jannoray, "Nouvelles Inscriptions de Lébadée," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 64–65 (1940–1941), 36–59 (38–40).

[189] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 349.

[190] Lawrence/Tomlinson, pp. 72–73, which includes a detailed description of how wooden-beamed roof-supports (i.e., ceilings) were constructed; see also Hodge, *Greek Roofs*, pp. 35–44.

that παλαιά is by no means a rare term in tragedy, and that it often does no more that convey an aura of remoteness on the object to which it is applied. Moreover, Willink characterizes τεκτόνων πόνον as no more than "a traditional phrase," comparing its appearance in Aeschylus' fr. 357 (*TrGF* 3) and in the variant readings which are attested in some mss. for γεῖσα τειχέων τάδε at *Or.* 1620.[191] That may be the case, but its juxtaposition with παλαιά suggests something more deliberate, just as παλαιά, immediately followed by τεκτόνων πόνον in apposition, must be given a more particular cast in relation to that gloss, as Jannoray too surmised.[192] There is thus an added degree of pathos when Orestes does in fact reach such a state that allows him to order Electra and Pylades to set the cherished blocks ablaze, after a last admiring look; only a *deus ex machina* in the form of Apollo prevents his order from being carried out.

In Euripides θριγκός and γεῖσον, two terms for the constituent parts of architectural superstructures, are deployed with remarkable technical precision in situations in which a tensely emotional activity is taking place that requires precise, realistic characterization of the physical setting, while some allowance for metaphorical allusion is tolerated or even encouraged. However, these are not the only terms that this playwright employs for the topmost parts of walls and other structures, and the fact that he has many to choose from virtually requires an interpretation or translation that respects the intentional specificity of the selected terminology. In some of the most memorable of those scenes whose color and dramatic effectiveness depend upon architectural specificity, Euripides, alone of the three tragedians, digs deeper into his repertoire of technical vocabulary in order to realize his ends.

One of the most well-known and debated is *Or.* 1370–1372. In a small interlude which has struck some as in intentional interjection of humor, a Phrygian slave reports that he has just escaped death by "Argive sword" by scrambling over the "cedar beams" and the "Doric triglyphs" of the portico of Menelaus' palace (κεδρωτὰ παστάδων ὑπὲρ τέραμνα Δωρικάς τε τριγλύφους). Willink calls the Phrygian slave in *Or.* "one of E.'s most brilliant and original contributions to ancient drama."[193] Some have considered the slave's account of the doings in the palace a parody of barbarian

---

[191] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 342; cf. his remarks on v. 1620, p. 349.

[192] Jannoray, "Nouvelles Inscriptions de Lébadée," p. 39, n. 3: "Au v. 1570, l'idée importante est non dans ῥήξας mais dans παλαιά, que développe τεκτόνων πόνον: Orest lancera à la tête de Ménélas un fragment de corniche, il n'hésitera pas à le faire bein que cette corniche soit vénérable et précieusement ornementée."

[193] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 305.

speech and behavior; he is, by his own admission, engaged in βαρβάροισι δρασμοῖς (*Or.* 1374).[194] But the unexpectedly erudite architectural language with which the slave describes his escapade would seem to belie such facile conclusions; better is the view of M.L. West, who—without noting the architectural specificity—considers the language of the slave's song "articulate, high-flown, typical of late Euripidean lyric," adding: "Its incongruity in the mouth of such a character is part of the humour of this delectable scene."[195] Case in point: the Phrygian's use of ἐξέδραισι ("outlying apartments" [Willink], "verandahs," or even "latrines" [West]) at v. 1450, according to Willink, "the first occurrence of a word which developed more specialized senses."[196] Willink, however, argues that the architectural description at vv. 1370–1372 must not be taken literally but that it is simply a way of referring to the slave's running "beyond the confines of" (ὑπέρ, v. 1371) the σκηνή representing the palace facade.[197] This cannot be right, as the language seems too deliberately chosen. Paley, on the other hand, attempts to interpret the description literally in terms of palace architecture, as does Bluma L. Trell; while I do not concur with the latter's explanation that the slave makes his exit through a window in the pediment, she does, however, argue a good case that "domestic buildings, even before the age of great stone temples, had pediments," an important point for venturing an interpretation of Euripides' lines.[198] But before I do so, a brief examination of additional Euripidean occurrences of each of the three architectural terms used in this passage, τέραμνα, παστάς, and τρίγλυφος, and their synonyms, will demonstrate the care and specificity with which Euripides has the slave present his version of events, as well as the technical sophistication of the Phrygian's speech.

---

194 Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 305, reviews the literature but cautions that "the outrageousness should not be exaggerated." Froma Zeitlin, "The Closet of Masks: Role-Playing and Myth-Making in the *Orestes* of Euripides," (1980, rev. in Judith Mossman, ed., *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Euripides* [Oxford, 2003], pp. 309–341) (318–319, with n. 18), sees this episode as emblematic of the "turbulent text" and the "chaotic and turbulent plot" of *Orestes*: "The whole play can, on one level, be read as an inquiry into the breakdown of language, speech, semantics, and communication … The major symbol of this process is the Phrygian slave's rendition of Greek …".

195 West, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 277.

196 West, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 281; Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 320; cf. LSJ, s. v.

197 Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 307.

198 Paley[2] 3, p. 316; Bluma L. Trell, "A Numismatic Solution of Two Problems in Euripides," *Numismatic Chronicle* 4 (1964), 93–101 (98).

First, τέραμνα: The term can denote "house," "roof" or, in this case, "roof (actually, ceiling) beams." Bear in mind that both the horizontal cornices and the raking cornices and their constituent parts may be referred to, loosely, as the "roof" from the point of view of the exterior of the building. Inside, of course, the horizontal members would be considered the ceiling. W.S. Barrett, in reference to the term's appearance at *Hipp.* 418, translates "timbers," adding: "The basic meaning of the word seems to have embraced both 'building material' and 'building'." Barrett also points out the novelty of Euripides' use of τέραμνα (alternately, τέρεμνα), observing that "in early Greek the word appears only in Eur."[199] Other than Euripides, where, always in the plural, it is a favored term, it makes a rare appearance in a late third-century BC inscription from Delos which records a poem by Maiistas (*IG* XI 4 1299. 41).[200] It is not Homeric, and does not seem to have been used regularly in building inscriptions. The Euripidean examples are many and varied: It refers loosely to the temple of Apollo at Delphi at *Hipp.* 536, to the house of Hades at *Alc.* 457, and, in *Trojan Women* to the (wooden?) buildings of Troy at 1296. At *Hipp.* 418 (its only non-lyric appearance) it refers to roof beams or rafters of a house, mentioned undoubtedly with a foretaste of doom by Phaedra; at v. 768 it is used of the roof beams of Phaedra's bridal chamber, from which she will suspend a noose. Another suicide by hanging from the τέραμνα, this one, an attempt by the blind Oedipus, is described at *Ph.* 333. Indirectly related to this meaning of τέραμνα may be the use at *Ba.* 633 of συντεθράνωται, a verb which occurs only here. It is possible that the verb may be associated with θρᾶνος in its architectural sense to refer to "beam" or "top course of masonry in a temple," both senses of which appear in inscriptions.[201] Either usage would fit the context of

---

[199] W.S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos* (1964; repr. Oxford, 1992), p. 235, a conclusion now confirmed by *TLG*, s. v. On the logistics of using the roof as a setting for action on the Euripidean stage, see Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, pp. 29–34.

[200] Iohannes U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323–146 A. C.* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 68–71. The subject is the foundation of the Delian cult of Serapis, which includes a lengthy account of the construction of a temple; it is recounted in both a prose version by the priest Apollonios II and a metrical version in hexameters by the otherwise unattested "Maiistas," who worked as an encomiographer for the temple, according to B. Hudson McLean, "The Place of Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos," in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, eds. John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson (London and New York, 1996), pp. 186–225 (206–208, with n. 93), who also provides a full translation, the only one, to my knowledge, available in English.

[201] LSJ, s. v. ii, 1–2; cf. *IG* II^2 463. 51, from late fourth-century BC Athens, associated with the building of a wall.

Ba. 633, a reference to the collapse of Pentheus' palace, which could find both the ceiling beams and the blocks of the entablature collapsing in upon one another (συν-).[202]

It is not surprising that, given the frequency of occurrences of τέραμνα and the tragic significance of roof beams in the play, *Hippolytus* is the source for an analogy that concerns building construction and a roof. The point of the analogy at *Hipp.* 468–469 has generated much speculation but remains elusive. F.A. Paley wonders whether a line has dropped out.[203] It is not entirely clear whether a simile or a metaphor or even a direct analogy underlies the comment about the roof. While something like ὥς, of course, would have made the intent less ambiguous, the introductory conjunctions, οὐδ' … οὐδέ, suggest that the comparison lies generally in the notion that "one should no more do this than do that." The fact that a "sink or swim" metaphor follows on its heels may or may not be relevant to the argument, since Euripides is not averse to mixing or stacking metaphors.[204] There is the possibility that the nurse is gesturing toward the actual roof of the palace, as if by a premonition of the role that it will later play in Phaedra's plans.[205] My interpretation of the meaning and the syntax of these lines diverges from those of Barrett and other commentators in that I am suggesting that it is the parts of the building that are obscured by the roof which allow for less precision (an interpretation that is justified, I think, by the adjective κατηρεφεῖς), while Barrett and others believe it is the roof, itself, since it would not be seen, that need not be perfect.[206] Such differences of interpretation are understandable, for, as Michael Halleran observes, "this precise image is not found elsewhere in tragedy."[207]

---

[202] Noting, however, that Hesychius had glossed this word with συμπέπτωκε (s. v.; Σ 2710 Schmidt), "evidently with reference to this passage," since it is a *hapax*, E.R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae* (1944; 2nd ed. Oxford, 1960), p. 155, followed by Richard Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1997), p. 202, concludes: "The word is probably connected not with θρᾶνος but with θραύω ['shatter']."

[203] Paley² 1, p. 195, following Monk.

[204] Cf. *Tr.* 115–118; *HF* 1094–1097, both involving a ship as the primary referent and architecture as a secondary one.

[205] Contra Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 245.

[206] Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos* pp. 244–245, following W.S. Hadley, *The Hippolytus of Euripides* (Cambridge, Eng., 1949), p. 77, and the revised views of Paley² 1, p. 195; cf. Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 190; Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, p. 94.

[207] Halleran, ibid.; cf. Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 553, who is unable to find any parallel for the image in earlier literature, only later, comparing Arist. *EN* 1094b12–14 and 1098a26–b2, which arguably mirror the spirit, if not the color, of E.'s image.

In the passage in question, Phaedra's nurse, advising her mistress on matters of love, criticizes the overwrought, over-analyzed, life that strives for perfection at every level. She suggests that the details of life need not be belabored (ἐκπονεῖν), one imagines, to the point of what we moderns would call stress. By way of illustration she offers the following: As a builder, you would not aim for a fine finish (καλῶς ἀκριβώσαις ἄν) in those parts of the building which the roof conceals or overshadows, the details of which are never seen by any but the builder, himself.[208] The Parthenon frieze is an example of the exception that proves the rule. Though the frieze was effectively obscured in antiquity by the shadow of the roof, economy and common sense were nonetheless abandoned and the degree of precision and of finish in its carving, as everywhere on this building, remains high.[209] The norm, however, would permit less precision in the execution of those parts which would be seen only from a distance or in shadow, as is the case in the pediments of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, for example, where the figures are planar, their backs unfinished and much of the detail of the hair was painted rather than carved. For the present purposes, determining the precise nuance of the analogy is less important than the fact that, as the scholiast also recognized, when Euripides needs a model for the very idea of precision, he turns to the art of building.[210]

Second, παστάς: *Or.* 1371 is the only occurrence in Euripides of παστάς in the plural for "portico." With the exception of Sophocles' *Antigone* 1207, where it is used of the cave in which Antigone is imprisoned and dies, it is uncommon in poetry, occurring more often in prose, but still relatively rare until after the Classical period, when it is well-documented.[211] More often, however, Euripides uses another, equally

---

[208] There are two major emendations in the text that Diggle prints, which I am following: Valckenaer changes the relative pronoun from the gen. to the dat.; Hadley suggests ἀκριβώσαις ἄν instead of ἀκριβώσειαν. They do not, however, significantly affect my interpretation.

[209] For one example of a theory of viewing, see Robin Osborne, "The Viewing and Obscuring of the Parthenon Frieze," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107 (1987), 98–105; Ian Jenkins, *The Parthenon Frieze* (Austin, TX, 1994), pp. 17–18, has a good summary of the issues of location and viewing.

[210] In a comparable situation, at *Hec.* 807, to be discussed later, he turns to the art of painting. On the technical nature of the comments of the scholiast, which include references to κανών and δοκοί, see Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 245. The scholiast is the first to assume that the analogy is based upon the notion that complete accuracy in the building of a roof is unattainable; it is this interpretation, embraced by Paley[1] 1, p. 184, that was substantially revised by Paley[2] 1, p. 195 and followed by Hadley, *The Hippolytus of Euripides*, p. 77, and Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 245.

[211] *TLG*, s. v.; early occurrences include Hdt. 2. 148. 27–28 and 169. 22; Xen. *Mem.*

rare, term for "portico."[212] At *Ba.* 639 Pentheus steps into the προνώπια of his palace, which lies otherwise in ruins as the result of a divine act perpetrated by Dionysos in retribution for being imprisoned. The word προνώπια (cf. προνώπιον) is found outside of Euripides almost exclusively in the works of grammarians and lexicographers, the main purpose of which, in some cases, is to elucidate the tragic use of the term.[213] In adjectival form, modifying the subject, Dionysos, and describing him with respect to his location, the term occurs again at *Ba.* 645.[214] The sense seems to be that there is something left standing of the palace, very likely, its front porch. That this is so is supported by the fact that Trozen is called τόδ' ἔσχατον προνώπιον of the land of Pelops at *Hipp.* 373–374, in allusion to its geographical location at the forefront of the Peloponnese.[215] Hesychius, s. v. (Π 3600 Schmidt) characterizes the προνώπια as a kind of picture gallery: τὰ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν πυλῶν, καθάπερ ἐνώπια τὰ ἔνδον, ὅπου αἱ εἰκόνες τίθενται.[216] The description may owe something to the Homeric formula πρὸς ἐνώπια παμφανόωντα ("at the shining entrance wall," as at *Il.* 8. 435; *Od.* 22. 121; cf. σέμν'† ἐνώπι' at A. *Supp.* 146), which suggests a kind of holy ambiance in the front porticoes of important buildings.

---

3. 8. 9, where it appears to be confused with παραστάς (see below) and should refer to the space between the doorposts, and *Hiero* 11. 2. 3; and a number in Menander. It is documented in inscriptions, e.g., *IG* XI 4 1299. 57, the hymn by Maiistas.

[212] On the symbolic content of the various terms for "portico" and the areas of the house that they signify in epic poetry and tragedy, see Gloria Ferrari, *Figures of Speech. Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, IL, and London, 2002), pp. 35–43.

[213] *TLG*, s. v. Hesychius (s. vv. προνώπια, προνώπιον; Π 3600 Schmidt) defines the terms respectively as τὰ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν πυλῶν and τὸ προκείμενον, οἷον πρόθυρον; others follow suit. On προνώπια, προνώπιον in E. and in tragedy, see Eust. 82. 35–36; 312. 13 (Van der Valk); Pollux 2. 53. 7–8 (Bethe). While προνώπια is not documented in inscriptions as a technical architectural term, it could be analogous with documented terms such as πρόναος, πρόδομος, πρόστασις, and προστάς, all used to refer to some type of front porch (LSJ, s. v., and D. Robertson, *Handbook*, p. 388, s. v. *Pronaos*).

[214] Cf. the ἥρωσι προνωπίοις of D.H. 4. 14. 3, which probably refers to herm-like statues, perhaps the *lares compitales*, placed in the vestibule of the Roman house, according to Earnest Cary, *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, 2 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1939), p. 313, n. 7 and 314, n. 1.

[215] Paley[2] 1, p. 189, suggests "the vestibule or front, i.e. foreland, of the Peloponnesus, as being the first point reached from the east." Cf. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 227, (followed by Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 181), who adds that, from the point of view of the speaker, an Athenian, "Trozen when seen across the Saronic Gulf from Athens lies in front of the main mass of the Peloponnese." Halleran (loc. cit.) notes of προνώπιον that it is a "very rare word … found in poetry only here and twice in *Bacch.*"

[216] For further information on these εἰκόνες, see Hesychius, s. v. ἐγκουράδες (E 200 Schmidt).

Sometimes confused with παστάς, and rarer still, is the related term παραστάς. A staple of building inscriptions, the term makes infrequent appearances in literature and, aside from the Euripidean examples, does not occur in poetry, demonstrating once again that Euripides' technical language is often paralleled more extensively in technical contexts than in other writers like himself, and providing further verification that this arcane vocabulary cannot be considered "poetic."[217] Its derivation from the verb παρίσταμαι ('to stand beside') is its rationale for adaptation into the architect's vocabulary. Euripides uses the term in either the singular or the plural, as at *Ph.* 415 (pl.), *Andr.* 1121 (sing.) and *IT* 1159 (pl.), to refer to doorposts or doorjambs, pilasters, antae (the ends of the walls which may or may not contain engaged columns or pilasters), and the space between them. The term so-used is found in contemporary late fifth-century building inscriptions such as *IG* I^3 474 (col. I) 73, associated with the Erechtheum. According to Vitruvius (3. 2. 1–2) a temple *in antis* was called by the Greeks ναὸς ἐν παραστάσιν, which is further defined as one which has in the front antae terminating the walls and two columns between the antae. Vitruvius' use of the term to define itself allows, as does modern usage, for "antae" to refer to the ends of the walls whether or not they are finished with pilasters. In the plural at *Ph.* 415 παραστάδας are doorposts or jambs, appropriate Bronze age examples of which may be seen at the Lions Gate, Mycenae. They are either antae or the space between in the plural at *IT* 1159 (ἐν παραστάσιν), where Iphigenia appears holding the statue of Artemis.[218] At *Andr.* 1121 Neoptolemus,

[217] LSJ, s. v.; cf. *TLG*, s. v. Pollux 1. 76 (Bethe) appears to consider the term a synonym for σταθμοί (in the sense of 'door posts'): τὰ ἑκατέρωθεν ξύλα κατὰ πλευρὰν τῶν θυρῶν; while Hesychius, s. v. παραστάδες (Π 670 Schmidt) has 'columns turned at (πρός + dat.) the walls', which suggests antae; in Vitruvius 10. 10. 2, "parastaticae" are the side-pieces, right and left, of a type of catapulting machine. Epigraphical appearances include *IG* I^3 474 (col. I) 73, a building account of the Erechtheum from ca. 409/8 B. C; *IG* II^2 1666 A 73, 92 (for interpretation of the term here, see Davis, *Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions*, pp. 21–23; cf. Kristian Jeppesen, *Paradeigmata. Three Mid-fourth Century Main Works of Hellenic Architecture Reconsidered* [Jutland Archeological Society Publications] 4 [Denmark, 1958], p. 129), and 1668. 32, both fourth-century building inscriptions from Eleusis, and 1672. 131, 186, also from Eleusis; *SIG* 307. 12, a fourth-century honorary decree from Iasos; *CIG* 2782. 29, from Aphrodisias. The term also appears in the Parthenon building accounts (T.L. Shear, Jr., *Studies in the Early Projects of the Periklean Building Program* [Diss.: Princeton, 1966], p. 275). Caskey notes in Paton, *The Erechtheum*, p. 312: "Παραστάς occurs in building inscriptions with the following meanings: (1) door-jamb, (2) anta, (3) pilaster, (4) wall decorated with pilasters."

[218] Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 158, observes that a ms. has the dat. sing. of παράστασις, "perhaps in ignorance of the somewhat rare word παραστάς." Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, p. 29, includes the term in a catalog of architectural features

caught virtually unarmed in an ambush at the temple of Apollo at Delphi, grabs a set of votive arms down from pegs hanging over the doorway (παραστάδος / κρεμαστά); in the singular, the word likely refers to the space between the antae at the entrance to the temple.[219] Neoptolemus, himself, according to the chorus' prediction at *Tr.* 575–576, had similarly dedicated at a Phthian temple the arms of his father's one-time bitterest

---

alluded to in E. that might have been represented on the stage, but concludes that "nothing could be said with certainty about the architectural feature referred to in *IT* 1159;" he lists "doorposts," "pilasters," and "antae" among the possibilities, and wonders as well whether it might be our only evidence for the identification of the "secluded place" on stage that E. requires in scenes where one character cannot be seen by the others (op. cit., p. 28).

[219] So A.R.F. Hyslop, *The Andromache of Euripides* (London, 1929), p. 126, who compares S. *Ant.* 1221: κρεμαστὴν αὐχένος ("hanging by the neck"), adding: "Arms and trophies were commonly hung up there." Iolaus does something similar at E. *Heracl.* 695–696, but there we are told only that the weapons are ἐν δόμοισιν ἔνδον … τοῖσδ'. Admittedly, the meaning of the term παραστάς at *Andr.* 1121 is by no means certain. P.T. Stevens, *Euripides Andromache* (1971; repr. Oxford, 2001), p. 229 (cf. Michael Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache* [Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1994], p. 157) offers: "probably … the side wall of the pronaos or entrance porch." Paley^2 2, p. 306, suggests: " 'suspended from the side pilasters' (*antae*) … where armour taken in battle used to be fixed up by nails." In arguing that Neoptolemus never finds himself in the doorway, since all of the action takes place in the temple proper, Winnington-Ingram, "The Delphic Temple," pp. 489–490, with n. 17, does not accept παραστάς as a reference to antae, but offers no alternative identification of the term. While I prefer the intercolumniations of the antae, all of these suggestions have some plausibility. As Lloyd, loc. cit., notes, W. Kendrick Pritchett (*The Greek State at War*, 3 [Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1979], pp. 262–263) points to inscriptions that refer to weaponry hung on the παραστάς and between the intercolumniations; numerous examples of shields, swords, and other silver and gold objects positioned πρὸς τῇ παραστάδι appear in the Erechtheum inventory lists from the fourth century BC (Diane Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* [Oxford, 1995], pp. 207–214, nos. 4, 7, 14, 15 [shields and swords], 17, 24, 26, 43, 51 [other objects]); in the Erechtheum, a building with a ground plan that is exceptional in every way, this could indicate any number of locations. Attic treasure-list *IG* II^2 1455. 27 (revised text of Arthur M. Woodward, "Two Attic Treasure-Records," in *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson* [Harvard Studies in Classical Philology] suppl. 1 [Cambridge, MA, 1940], pp. 377–407 [399–400]) has shields hanging in interior intercolumniations (ἐν τοῖς μετακι]ονίοις) of the Parthenon, according to Woodward, op. cit., p. 402; see also Pritchett, op. cit., pp. 262–263, with n. 94, where he points to examples of artistic renderings of shields and weapons hung from the architrave and suspended between the columns, as well as attached to the columns themselves; Pritchett also mentions a column drum from the interior of the Stoa Poikile in the Athenian agora that features a hole, possibly evidence for hanging directly on the column the shields taken from the Lacedaemonians captured at Sphacteria in 425 BC, one of which has been found (Thompson and Wycherly, *Agora 14*, p. 92, with n. 50). In general, on the practice of dedicating items of armor in temples, see Pritchett, op. cit. pp., 240–295; for an exceptional arrangement of shield offerings, see Lippman et al., "*Knights* 843–859."

enemy, Hector, which appear at Andromache's and Astyanax's side in the wagon which bears the two to their respective fates.

In another of its technical manifestations σταθμός is sometimes used as a synonym for παραστάς, in the latter's sense of "jamb" rather than "pilaster" or "anta," and therefore may be assumed to refer to any vertical, i.e., supporting member.[220] At *Or.* 1474 the awkwardness of taking θύρετρα καὶ σταθμούς as a hendiadys for "stable doors," with Willink, is alleviated if σταθμούς is interpreted as a reference to a specific architectural member rather than more loosely as a reference to the structure in its entirety, the most common of its many meanings.[221] The allusion in this case could be to a ridgepole, the door jambs, or for that matter any other supporting member. Whether or not these things were actually destroyed during the frantic attempt by servants to rescue Helen from almost certain murder is irrelevant; the impression of general pandemonium (ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν, *Or.* 1476) is only enhanced by introducing the contingency of knocking down any architectural hindrance to reaching her. Virtually the same phraseology occurs at *HF* 999, where θύρετρα and σταθμά form part of the structure of the door of Heracles' house which are broken down or dismantled during his murderous rampage as if, in his delusional state, "[they were] Cyclopean [walls]."[222] Here the terms used together are probably meant to stand in a general sense for both the horizontal and the vertical members, or the movable and the fixed parts, respectively, of the door unit, and thereby—in similar fashion to the previous example, but in the latter case in conjunction with three verbs (σκάπτει μοχλεύει … κἀκβαλών, *HF* 999), two in asyndeton—to articulate the completeness of the demolition of the door. Appearing only in its plural form, θύρετρα, while not an uncommon term, conforms to a familiar pattern of multiple Homeric uses, once in Pindar (*I.* 7. 6), a smattering of additional appearances in poetic contexts and numerous occurrences in miscellaneous, mostly late, prose authors, inscriptions, and, alone of the tragedians, Euripides.[223] Its appearances at *Or.* 1474 and

---

220 Cf. D. Robertson, *Handbook*, p. 384, s. v. "jamb." In this sense it appears in S. *El.* 1331 (σταθμοῖσι τοῖσδε), which a scholiast glosses: ἐν ταῖς παραστάσιν.

221 Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 325.

222 For this form of the plural, LSJ, s, v, ii. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 319, suggests 'door-flaps' and 'door posts', respectively, noting that "ἐκβάλλω is the normal word for breaking down a door." Paley[2] 3, p. 75, believes that the θύρετρα are simply "the doors of the γυναικωνῖτις, the πύλαι of v. 997."

223 LSJ, s. v.; cf. *TLG*. Epigraphical appearances include *IG* IV 1484 A 30, a fourth-century building inscription from Epidauros; *IG* XI 2 161 A 66, 68, a third-century building inscription from Delos in which τὰς θύρας and τὰ θύρετρα appear to be

HF 999 suggest that the term refers loosely to any non-supporting part of the door structure, in short, the *movable* parts, sometimes including the bolts. That θύρετρα refer strictly speaking only to the movable parts of a door is reinforced at *Ba*. 448 where the keys unbolt the doors (θύρετρα) without the aid of human hands but through the power of Dionysos, freeing the women from the prison into which they have been ordered by Pentheus. Clearly, structural features like jambs or antae are out of the question in this instance, although the frame, itself, was apparently removable.[224]

In *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Russell Meiggs reports that Cypress wood was the "most appreciated" material for doors "from the Bronze Age onwards."[225] Wood was always expensive in the ancient world, primarily because of the difficulties involved in obtaining and transporting it. The construction of a door and door frame could require several different types of wood and a number of joins, making it easy to imagine the act of dismantling the construction piece by piece. Just how many parts (and at what great expense, each) could be involved in the construction of a door is illustrated by a fourth-century inscription associated with the construction of the Temple of Asclepius at Epidauros, which Meiggs translates. Among the individual items itemized as contracted for, along with the names of the individual contractors and the price paid, are: the "great door" itself, ivory parts, inlay work, hinges with their plates and bolts, collars for the pivots, nails, pitch and glue, and lock and key.[226] To this could be added the decoration of the door jambs, the κοιλόσταθμος, as in another contract associated with the construction of the third-century BC temple of Apollo at Delos.[227]

---

distinguished (as also in *IG* XII 2 14, from Mytilene, where the latter are μαρμάρινα); *IG* XI 4 1299. 57, the hymn by Maiistas.

[224] Meiggs, *Trees and Timber*, pp. 204 and 208, cites Demosthenes' speech against Meidias (21. 167), who, as a trierarch during a campaign in Euboea, rather than returning with the others, used his ship to transport back home doors and door frames, among other things, from Styros. The method by which he obtained these things is not made clear; however Meiggs, op. cit., p. 208, observes that "the stealing of doors was not uncommon."

[225] Meiggs, *Trees and Timber*, pp. 99, 110, and 425.

[226] Meiggs, *Trees and Timber*, pp. 425–426, with 449, a detailed description of the types of woods used for the various wooden components of a door and how they were assembled.

[227] This is the interpretation offered by Meiggs, *Trees and Timber*, p. 449 (following F. Courby, *Les Temples d'Apollon, Délos* 12 [1931], 329), of a word whose meaning is "very uncertain." For me the suggestion makes perfect sense, in light of the foregoing discussion of σταθμός. LSJ, s. v., however, translates the term in the Delian inscription (*IG* XI 2 287 A 96, B 146) 'coffered ceiling'.

According to Meiggs in the ancient world the removal of a door could be thought of as a symbolic act, for doors were among the most highly valued and sometimes the most expensive features of houses and temples. He cites a passage in Thucydides (2. 14. 1) in which the evacuating inhabitants of Attica bring along their children, wives, children, household furnishings, and even the woodwork of their houses, which surely included the doors and door frames, as well as Herodotus 1.17. 2, where, in a sixth-century war between Lydia and Miletus, Lydian soldiers destroy the crops but leave the farm buildings intact: οὔτε ἐνεπίμπρῃ οὔτε θύρας ἀπέσπα.[228] In both *Heracles* and *Orestes* Euripides demonstrates an awareness that there could be no more certain emblem of the finality of literal and symbolic destruction than a door, the real and symbolic means of access and egress between the worlds of the oikos and the polis, the private and the public, being dismantled into parts and broken down.

The third and final architectural term used by the Phrygian slave in his description of his escape route at *Or.* 1370–1372, τρίγλυφος, appears three times in Euripides, but rarely elsewhere; it too is better paralleled in inscriptions.[229] Alternating with metopes to form the so-called "Doric frieze," the triglyph is an architectural member exclusively associated with Doric buildings, as the Phrygian slave at *Or.* 1370–1372 recognizes. Inspired by a thesis of Vitruvius (probably based upon earlier sources), many modern architectural historians assume that the distinctive faceted tripartite format of the triglyph derives from, and persists as a reminder of, the visual appearance of the ends of the wooden beams which would have been positioned there to form the roof in an earlier developmental phase when the component parts of the colonnade and entablature were made of wood.[230] Thus the slave's claim to have traversed both the beams

---

[228] Meiggs, *Trees and Timber*, pp. 207–208; see also note 224, above.

[229] LSJ, s. v. ii and *rev. suppl.*, s. v., which adds Arist. *EN* 1174a 26, where the term is found in a discussion of κίνησις which includes as a comparandum a characterization of building a temple part by part; cf. *TLG*, s. v. Diphilus, *PCG* 5, fr. 61. 2 (*Parsitos*) includes "triglyphs" along with "roofs" as things which a guest claims he does not look at when he is invited to eat at the house of a rich man. It is not found in A. or S. Epigraphical occurrences include *IG* II^2 1666 A 24 (partially restored), and 1668. 28, 30, both fourth-century BC building inscriptions from Eleusis; *SIG* 246 iii. 25–39, where it appears four times, with some restorations, and 247 ii. 61, 64, both fourth-century BC building inscriptions associated with the temple of Apollo at Delphi.

[230] D. Robertson, *Handbook*, p. 64; Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, pp. 56–57; the drawing reproduced in Mark Wilson Jones, "Tripods, Triglyphs, and the Origin of the Doric Frieze," *American Journal of Archaeology* 106 (2002), 353–390 (355, Fig. 1), shows clearly the differences between the hypothetical wooden prototype and a Classical marble temple entablature. Vitruvius 4. 2. 2–3 is our source for the

and the "Doric triglyphs" is not illogical. It is likely that he means to disclose that he made his way into the attic of the building's porch, clambered over the beams of the ceiling, and then slipped through an (open?) metopal slot that was the goal of his trek.

This very method of entrance and escape is contemplated by Pylades and Orestes at *IT* 113–114, a highly problematic passage whose potential significance as evidence for the history of Greek architecture has been recognized and debated from at least as early as 1762, when Johann Joachim Winckelmann discussed it in his *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten*.[231] While I cannot claim to have resolved all of the difficulties, textual and logistic, connected with the passage, I venture the following as an interpretation. In Euripides play the two men are gazing at the temple of Artemis as they hatch plans to steal the wooden *agalma* of the goddess. The passage in question reads, in J. Diggle's (obelized) version: ὅρα δέ γ' εἴσω τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν / δέμας καθεῖναι. Pylades evidently notices an opening (κενόν) in the entablature through which they might enter and escape with their booty under the protective cover of night. Editors and commentators such as Diggle, Cropp, David Kovacs, and, most recently, Poulheria Kyriakou, have struggled as much with the sense as with the soundness of the text, leaving them no recourse but to obelize heavily and to posit corruption, lacunae, or interpola-

so-called "petrification" theory. Archaeological evidence for the transition from wood to stone in a peripteral colonnade over an extended period of time has been identified in the remains of the Archaic temple of Hera at Olympia (Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, pp. 53–56). Not all, however, accept the petrification theory as an explanation for triglyphs. Oliver M. Washburn, "Iphigenia Taurica 113 as a Document in the History of Architecture," *American Journal of Archaeology* 22 (1918), 434–437; Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 71; and Jones, op. cit., pp. 353–356, all discuss its various problems and offer alternative solutions. Lawrence/Tomlinson, pp. 70–71, iterating a popular thesis, suggest that the triglyph frieze represents a decorative schema for articulating a long horizontal, whether it appears on a Geometric vase (as, e.g., John Boardman, *Early Greek Vase Painting* [London, 1998], figs. 57, 64, and 88), on furniture, or on the entablature of a building. In a more recent study and thorough review of the evidence, Jones, op. cit., concludes that the triglyph derives its form from the tripod.

231 Joseph Eiselein, *Johann Winckelmann. Sämtliche Werke*, 2 (Donaueschingen, 1825), pp. 389–390; so, too, Karl Bötticher, *Die Tektonik der Hellenen*, 1 (Potsdam, 1852), p. 169. Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 80, is perhaps too dismissive of the interest and significance of the passage, even if corrupt, as the author believes it is. She refrains from adding anything to the body of speculative architectural theories it has spawned, concluding: "In any case, the suggestion is too brief and ... unlikely to constitute a credible plan. Orestes does not comment on it at all."

tion.[232] Euripides' attempts at technical specificity could apparently confound the scribes, the textual critics, and the commentators equally. The meaning of the passage is, however, generally clear. Translate: "See [a space] inside that is empty of triglyphs through which (ὅποι) to let ourselves down" or, alternatively: "See an empty [space] beside (εἴσω) the triglyphs [that is, *between* the triglyphs, where the metopes would be] through which to let ourselves down." If one objects to moving κενόν outside of its clause, then the following might be preferable: "Look inside [that is, *through* the hole] at which place empty of triglyphs [it is possible] to let ourselves down."[233]

In the case of the first and third versions, it is likely that "triglyph" does duty here for what we would call "metope." Neither μετόπη, itself, nor its variants, the diminutives μετόπιον or μεθόπιον, are used by Euripides, nor, for that matter, any other ancient author outside of Hesychius (s. v. μεθόπιον; M 530 Schmidt) and Vitruvius (3. 5. 11; 4. 2. 4).[234] Furthermore it is far from certain whether the term μετόπη was used in ancient times in the same way as it has come to be used by modern architectural historians, that is, for the (usually sculptured) slabs that slip down into the slotted spaces between triglyphs. To judge from the variety of spellings and the rarity of the term, it seems possible that there was as much ancient confusion as there is modern about the various interstices

---

[232] Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 80, is emblematic: "Despite its vagueness and strange language, this barely understandable passage does not look like the work of an interpolator and should rather be assumed to be corrupt …" Cf. the *apparatus* of E.B. England, *The Iphigeneia Among the Tauri of Euripides* (London, 1950), p. 8: "In much perplexity I have adopted Blomfield's and Elmsley's corrections …".

[233] Less satisfactory is Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 70, who, noting the position of κενόν, prefers ὅπου (although he does not print it in his text), translating "where the inter-triglyph spaces [are]." Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 181, is stumped; his suggestion that εἴσω τριγλύφων may mean "inside the frieze" and, by deduction, simply "inside the temple" does not fit with the plan, which depends upon some sort of hole (κενόν) positioned high in the superstructure at the level of the triglyphs. Pylades' δέμας καθεῖναι makes it clear that they will have to drop from a height.

[234] *TLG*, s. vv.; cf. LSJ. On behalf of both the aspirated and the unaspirated versions of the terms, see Caskey, "Notes on Inscriptions from Eleusis," pp. 149–150, with references. Heschyius defines: μέρος τι τῆς καλουμένης ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιτεκτόνων τριγλύφ[ίρ]ου. Variations of these terms are documented in building inscriptions; e.g., μετόπια is found at *IG* II² 1666 A 31 and restored at 39 by Caskey, loc. cit., who argues that these are indeed metopes as we know them; cf. Jeppesen, *Paradeigmata*, pp. 124–125 and 131. On the other hand, the μέτωπον that occurs in one of the Erechtheum accounts (*IG* I³ 474 [col. I] 30) and elsewhere in building inscriptions is apparently not part of the Doric frieze, but a different architectural member altogether; see the discussion of Caskey in Paton, *The Erechtheum*, pp. 304–305.

and filler blocks which ultimately come to constitute the Classical form of the Doric frieze.[235] Vitruvius is the only ancient writer to use the form μετόπη (LSJ, s. v.).[236] At 3. 5. 11 Vitruvius claims that "metope" is the Greek term for *intersectio*, the space between the dentils; at 4. 2. 4 he notes that the term is used both for the intervals between dentils and between triglyphs. Of the etymology of the latter type of metope, Vitruvius (4. 2. 4), in a hotly debated passage, asserts that Greek "opae" are equivalent to Latin *cava columbaria*, holes for the reception of the ends of beams (indicated by triglyphs), and that the Greeks called the space in between two opae "metope." Testifying to the ambiguity of the evidence, archaeological and literary, on the origins of the Doric frieze, Oliver M. Washburn, in a reversal of the usual, that is, the Vitruvian, schema, shows convincingly how the *metopes* might be construed as the recipients of the beam ends with the triglyphs covering the spaces between—an arrangement which would well suit the language of *IT* 113–114.[237] However, we will stick with the traditional, Vitruvian model, which has nearly universal sanction.

Among the textual issues at *IT* 113, the form ὅπου has been suggested by Elmsley as a substitute for ὅποι, which could imply a reference to the space, itself, rather than the means by which to let oneself down; the two indirect correlatives, however, are virtually interchangeable. M. Platnauer prints ὅποι, but notes in his commentary that the form "is impossible," since, if it were meant to indicate "by which way," then it should be ὅπῃ (ὅπη, Kirchhoff's suggestion).[238] He has a point, but, in this case, the location and the means are one and the same; thus the indirect question "whither" or "where" is tantamount to asking "how," "in what way," or, both literally and figuratively, "through which." More seriously, many have regarded δέ γ' εἴσω at *IT* 113 with skepticism. It is unclear whether εἴσω should be taken as an adverb, to indicate the inside of the temple, or as a preposition with the genitive, τριγλύφων, in a locative sense, to

[235] For discussion of the ancient occurrences of the term and its variants, which include building inscriptions and Hesychius, in addition to Vitruvius, see Caskey, "Notes on Inscriptions from Eleusis," pp. 149–150; for a more recent treatment, see Jones, "Tripods, Triglyphs."

[236] Cf. Caskey, "Notes on Inscriptions from Eleusis," pp. 149–150; Oliver M. Washburn, "The Origin of the Triglyph Frieze," *American Journal of Archaeology* 23 [1919], 33–49 [37]; Bötticher, *Die Tektonik*, 1, p. 169.

[237] Washburn, "The Origin of the Triglyph Frieze," fig. 8; cf. Bötticher, *Die Tektonik*, 1, p. 169, who dismisses Vitruvius' explanation as "a false derivation," preferring the reverse arrangement.

[238] Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 70.

denote "within" or "on this side of" the triglyphs (LSJ, s. v. i, 2, b), or to suggest the motion of moving through and out. David Sansone notes "at least twenty-five" conjectures in this area of the text.[239] Only a few need briefly be considered here. C.J. Blomfield corrected to γεῖσα, which seems strained from an architectural standpoint, as geisa are components neither of triglyphs nor metopes but are part of the roof.[240] Diggle in his *OCT* text includes δέ γ' within his obeli, on another occasion citing the authority of Denniston that it "will not do" (at *IT* 1010 nor here) and registering disapproval of interpretations that depend on the particles so printed, though he does not offer an alternative.[241] In the Teubner edition of the *IT* text, Sansone prints ὅρα δέ γ'· ἔστι …, which, if I am not over-interpreting, would effectively eliminate the drama provided by the two actors' scrutinizing the temple for a place for entry and exit and simply has Pylades observing conditions that were thought to be true of all Doric temples; a translation of the Teubner text would thus be something like: "Wait a minute! It is possible to let ourselves down where there are no triglyphs [i.e., through the 'windows' of the metopes]."[242] Elsewhere Sansone proposes, more radically, εἰ σῷ (i.e., monosyllabic nom. pl. m. of σῶς) followed by the aorist optative καθεῖμεν rather than the infinitive, resulting in his offering a translation not dissimilar to my own: "See if we might safely let ourselves down where … there is an empty space in the triglyphs."[243] M. Marcovich, however, counters with εἰ σόν, translating: "Now, see if it is *thy* part to let thyself inside through the empty space in the triglyphs," and arguing that, in Sansone's version, the sense of encouragement which Pylades is offering to a wavering Orestes is missing, and that the form σῷ for σῶοι "cannot be established for Tragedy."[244] Washburn, in an effort to preserve the form, alters completely the logistics of Pylades' plan, arguing that εἴσω here means "'within' in the sense of 'beyond' or 'behind'," and proposing that the two were planning to go through an opening in the ceiling of the temple's porch, which lies just *behind* the triglyph frieze; it would be hard, however,

---

[239] David Sansone, "Miscellanea on Euripides *I.T.* 113–114," *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 29 (1976), 79.

[240] C.J. Blomfield, "Animadversiones quaedam in Euripidis Supplices et Iphigenias," *Museum Criticum* 1 (1826), 181–193 (191).

[241] J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), p. 87, with n. 2, citing Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, p. 155.

[242] David Sansone, *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris* (Leipzig, 1981).

[243] Sansone, "Miscellanea on Euripides *I.T.* 113–114."

[244] M. Marcovich, "Euripides *I.T.* 110–115," *Mnemosyne* ser. iv. 30 (1977), 288–289.

to imagine how such an opening could be spotted from a distance.[245] Personally I find no problem with εἴσω, whether it is regarded as an adverb or as a preposition; *pace* Sansone and others, it does not have to *translate* "between" to *mean* between, as my translations demonstrate.

What seems certain, despite the textual disparities, is that what Pylades has spotted is an empty or missing metope, that is, either a damaged portion of the building or an area that has fallen into disrepair. We need not picture regularly spaced openings, sometimes considered "windows," as Platnauer and others do, though evidence suggests that they existed in this very locale in buildings of an early date, to judge from the little triangular openings in the preserved models of temples from Perachora, though not all would agree that these openings served as prototypes for metopes.[246] Mark Wilson Jones faults the Euripidean passages being considered here for contributing to the mistaken impression that triglyphs are remnants of windows, a notion that he believes is successfully refuted by Vitruvius (4. 2. 4), who asserts that triglyphs cannot be "fenestrarum imagines," as some mistakenly claim, and goes on to explain why.[247] On the other side, Georges Roux argues against Vitruvius and on behalf of the "windows" theory of the triglyph's origins, but unfortunately does not discuss the Euripidean passages.[248] In the end, however, Jones' reservations about the passages are irrelevant to the present argument, which takes the position that the opening Pylades sees is exceptional, not normal. With this in mind, the debate that goes back as far as Winckelmann as to whether *IT* 113–114 (as well as *Or.* 1371–1372, where similar circumstances may be inferred) should be considered evidence for the existence of "windows" at the frieze level of early temples makes little sense.

If ὀπή ('hole') is indeed the linguistic basis of the word μετόπη, as is sometimes claimed, this implies that an opening was once there and that the eventual name for the covering block still preserves the idea of an interstice. Although Vitruvius (4. 2. 4) claims that "metope" refers to the *space between* the opae, which he takes to mean the holes for receiving the beam ends (i.e., the triglyphs), there is a possibility that the prefix μετά could be construed as suggesting motion or placement 'into the

---

245 Washburn, "Iphigenia Taurica 113," p. 436.

246 Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 70. E.g., Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 71, with fig. 82.

247 Jones, "Tripods, Triglyphs," p. 355, with n. 13.

248 Georges Roux, "La Tholos de Sicyone à Delphes et les origines de l'entablement dorique," in *Delphes: Centenaire de la "Grande Fouille" réalisée par l'École Française d'Athènes (1892–1903)*, ed. J.-F. Bommelaer (Leiden, 1992), pp. 151–166, esp. 159–164; cf. Böttischer, *Die Tektonik*, 1, p. 169.

middle of' (LSJ, s. v. c, i) something, that is, as a reference to the filler slab's being slid into position between the triglyphs.[249] Such ancient openings are unlikely, however, to be the referent for Euripides at *IT* 113–114. For the text, problematic as it may be, seems almost certainly to imply that the opening Pylades espies is out of the ordinary. The dialogue has the unmistakable feel of a "eureka!" moment which would not be the case if such openings were discernable all around. Pylades is surveying the building at the same time as he is exhorting Orestes to be bold and weighing the various consequences of discovery when lo! he spots the means whereby they might enter and exit without detection. He then continues, with renewed assertiveness, to endorse the plan. The tenor of the speech as a whole is speculative, as they have no idea whether they will succeed.[250] It is not hard to imagine that, even in Archaic and Classical buildings when what were formerly gaping holes were covered over by metopes, a broken or missing metope could have reopened the hole, allowing for crawl space between the triglyphs, a hypothetical condition which can be confirmed by observation of the ruined and despoiled entablature of the Parthenon as it survives today.[251]

To make sense of Pylades' plan, we should probably imagine a side entry of either a prostyle building (with its porch columns standing free of the ends of the antae, like the Ionic temple of Athena Nike on the Athenian Acropolis) or a temple *in antis* (with its porch columns standing between the antae, like the Doric Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi), both without surrounding colonnades. For our purposes the Athenian Treasury is particularly instructive, since it has a Doric frieze all around. Penetrating the Doric frieze as a way of entering a *peripteral* temple of the Classical period would make no sense, as it would still land the

---

[249] For additional etymological possibilities for "metope," see Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 220, n. 4.

[250] For this reason I have reservations about Diggle's citing of Denniston in rejecting δέ γε at *IT* 113, *Studies on the Text of Euripides*, p. 87, with n. 2, followed by others (Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 181; Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 80). It is true that Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, p. 155, lists the particle cluster's appearance at *IT* 113 under heading (ii), "Weakly adversative, or purely continuative," which he follows with the admonition that, of the "few apparent examples in tragedy, almost all of them [are] suspicious." I submit, however, that δέ γε at *IT* 113 fits better under Denniston's heading (i), "Strongly adversative." Of the few tragic occurrences in this category, Denniston observes: "there is usually, I think, a sense of imaginary dialogue: the speaker counters his own words."

[251] Admittedly, the backing blocks of the metopes would pose an obstacle, if they remained in place. However, we are perhaps being too dogmatic; the mere idea of a missing metope alone suggests "opening" and consequently, a breach in the façade.

intruders outside the cella proper.[252] Furthermore we are informed at *IT* 96–97, in the course of the discussion between the two men in front of the actual building, that "its walls are high on all sides" (ἀμφίβληστρα γὰρ τοίχων ... ὑψηλά), which suggests, but does not necessarily require, a building without a peripteral colonnade. Granted, the references to Artemis' temple(s) as εὐστύλων ("well-columned") at v. 128 and περικίονας ("peripteral") at v. 405, discussed above, would consequently seem to contradict this earlier information; in their defense, however, they occur in choral passages somewhat removed in tone from the pragmatic nature of the spoken dialogue in which Pylades and Orestes devise a method of entry and exit with the temple directly in front of them. Still, it is just possible to imagine a lateral entry into the attic area of an Archaic, if not necessarily a Classical peripteral temple.

Evidence from Pausanias (5. 20. 4–5) appears to confirm that entry into the attic of a peripteral temple was a real possibility, in this case, the Archaic temple of Hera at Olympia, the very building in whose colonnade the so-called "petrification" theory, that is, the gradual translation of constituent parts from wood into stone, may be most readily documented. Pausanias tells of the body of a hoplite who died from his wounds in a battle between the Eleans and the Lacedemonians of ca. 400 that was accidentally discovered in excellent condition in the attic of the temple in Pausanias' own day.[253] It is thought that the wounded man made his way into that area in order to seek a more effective defensive position and subsequently died there. A drawing, reproduced by W.B. Dinsmoor, showing the construction of a "proto-Doric" (mostly wooden) entablature of a type which is likely to have been featured on the Heraion makes it clear that entry through the triglyph frieze of even a peripteral temple would place one in the attic, that is, the space between the pitched roof and the ceiling, of the building proper.[254] With this theory one must assume that entry into the attic would make entry into the cella feasible.[255] In the final analysis I prefer to imagine a lateral entry through a prostyle or temple

---

[252] Cf. Washburn, "Iphigenia Taurica 113," p. 434.

[253] Pausanias says that he was told the story by one Aristarchos, a tour-guide at Olympia, who relayed that this event took place ἐπὶ τῆς ἡλικίας ... τῆς ἑαυτοῦ.

[254] Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, p. 57, fig. 20; the section drawing reproduced by Jones, "Tripods, Triglyphs," p. 355, fig. 1, conjectures an extension of the brick wall of the cella which blocks entry into the attic area, but this seems structurally superfluous.

[255] As does Washburn, "Iphigenia Taurica 113," p. 435, who does not, however, posit a peripteral temple.

in antis of the Archaic or Classical periods or, less likely, given the evidence of *IT* 96–97, a peripteral temple of the earlier period. Either way it is entirely possible to imagine penetration at the level of the triglyph frieze, exactly as Pylades proposes at *IT* 113–114.

A frontal entry through an opening in the ceiling of the porch of a temple *in antis* and thus *behind* the triglyph frieze, as proposed by Washburn, remains, I think, a not implausible but less likely alternative.[256] The ingenious proposal of Trell, that entry is through windows in the tympanum of the pediment, the existence of which she is able to document in representations of temples on coins, in models, and in the (Ionic) temple of Artemis at Ephesos, is certainly intriguing; she translates: "See where there is an empty place [i.e., the windows] to let / Your body down to the inner side of the triglyphs [i.e., the place where one would find oneself if using this entry]."[257] However, I would argue that the conspicuous presence of the rare term, "triglyphs," in *IT* 113, as well as its position in the line (i.e., following so closely upon ὅρα), strongly suggest that these specific architectural members ought better to be regarded as the focal point of the entry plan than as, more simply, a colorful way of saying "inside," after the fact of entry, as per Trell's translation. Furthermore, if windows are what Pylades espies, why does he not call them "windows," or why does he not describe their location more aptly (a mention of the roof might be expected)? Finally, why would they be under discussion as a potentially undetectable means of entry if these windows were in such a prominent location and visible to all at all times? Once again, I would counter that the opening Pylades sees is exceptional, not normal.

The Doric frieze makes another conspicuous appearance in *Bacchae*. At *Ba.* 1214 Agave, having recently dismembered her own son, thinking him to be a lion, proudly displays the trophy of her "hunt," Pentheus' head. She calls for a ladder so that the head up might be nailed up onto the τριγλύφοις of the facade of the palace, which is by now all that remains of the building which has been destroyed by divine intervention (vv. 633–634). Commentators are probably correct in deducing that, by "triglyphs," once again, an entire Doric frieze is meant, since the usual practice would be to display the heads of enemies or of sacrificial victims, or trophies of the hunt, perhaps, on the blank metopes of the frieze

256 Washburn, "Iphigenia Taurica 113," pp. 435–437.
257 Trell, "A Numismatic Solution," p. 97.

rather than on the triglyphs.[258] Insofar as the term can be a synecdoche for referring to the entire entablature, including the Doric frieze, Euripides' "triglyphs" may be thought of as loosely equivalent to θριγκός in the plural, when it is used in this sense, as in *IT* 74. More important than a literal translation is the image itself which involves what is likely an intentional visual pun that assumes familiarity with a specific architectural feature: the water spouts in the form of gape-mouthed lion heads that decorated many Classical temples, including the Parthenon.[259] These are often loosely referred to as antefixes, but properly speaking, the lion-head water spout is a functional fixture, appearing at the corners of the gutter, while an antefix is a decorative feature which served to conceal the unsightly ends of the tiles covering the roof. Terracotta antefixes sometimes appear as a human head, but usually they are in the form of the traditional palmette or a scroll.[260] Stone gable blocks carved with lion heads are mentioned in a building inscription associated with a fourth-century portico for the Telesterion at Eleusis (*IG* II^2 1666 B 19, and restored with certainty at 16, 27, 29, 31). Since they function as water spouts, the lion heads are actually set at roof level, that is, somewhat higher than the frieze, but the inevitably low vantage point of someone on the ground would create the illusion that the heads hang over the frieze. In her mad-

[258] Both Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 245–246, and Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 226–227, cite substantial ancient evidence to document all three practices. To their lists might be added the singular circumstances surrounding the events portrayed in a fragment of Aeschylus' lost satyr-play, *Theoroi or Isthmiastai* (frgs. 78a–82), where satyrs hang portraits of themselves on the temple of Poseidon at the Isthmus, on which see my "Aeschylus' *Theoroi* and Realism in Greek Art," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994), pp. 85–119. P. *I.* 4. 72, where the practice of "roofing the temple of Poseidon with the skulls of foreigners" is observed, may also be noted, as well as *IT* 74–75, discussed above.

[259] Lawrence/Tomlinson, fig. 166, shows a reconstruction drawing of the northeast corner of the Parthenon, with one of the lion-head water spouts which appeared at the gutter at the corner of the roof on the north side; matching ones were at all four corners of the temple; for color photographs of the Parthenon showing a lion-head water spout in situ, see R. Economakis, ed., *Acropolis Restorations. The CCAM Interventions* (London, 1994), pp. 28, 30, and 32. The form ultimately derives from Egypt, where they decorated temples of the Old Kingdom (Jaromir Malek, *Egyptian Art* [London, 1999], p. 113). Some of the variety of motifs which decorated the terminations of Greek temple roofs, including lion-head water spouts and various types of antefixes, are illustrated in Lawrence/Tomlinson, fig. 101.

[260] Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 73. The scene preserved in the fragment of Aeschylus' satyr-play, *Theoroi or Isthmiastai*, mentioned above (note 258) has been interpreted as a humorous proposal for an *aition* for temple antefixes by Eduard Fraenkel, "Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 28 (1942), 237–258 (245).

dened state Agave has conflated the lion-head water spout with which she was familiar with the bloody human head she held impaled on her thyrsus, still calling it a lion's, and attempted to put it back in its "proper" place, on the frieze, in the general vicinity of which she knew the water spouts should be. As early as 1836 Christopher Wordsworth had made the connection between the Parthenon lion heads and this passage, noting the "partial saneness" and "sense of propriety" which constitutes "one of the most natural and pathetic elements of madness," that was evident in Agave's decision to hang up the "lion's" head on the frieze.[261] So sincere is this pitiable mother that at *Ba.* 1240 she even uses language appropriate for a dedication (ἀγκρεμασθῇ) to request again that the head of her son be hung up on the palace facade.[262]

While our discussion is focused on superstructures, we might consider a term used by Euripides that has been, in my view, mistakenly associated with the architrave of a building: ἔμβολον. Even allowing for the many diverse meanings of this word, I do not believe that it can be stretched to permit such an interpretation.[263] Euripides, however, likely means to use it in one technical sense or another. There is in fact one that makes for a better fit. The passage in question is *Ba.* 591–592, where the chorus watch as something called ἔμβολα begin to fall along with the columns of the palace of Pentheus as it is destroyed by an earthquake induced by Dionysos: εἴδετε λάϊνα κίοσιν ἔμβολα / τάδε διάδρομα; ("Do you see these stoney *embola* reeling with the columns?"). These ἔμβολα are usually construed as lintel or architrave blocks tottering above the columns of the portico on the assumption that κίοσιν ἔμβολα is equivalent to κίοσιν ἐμβεβλημένα.[264] However, there is no inherent reason to interpret

---

[261] Wordsworth, *Athens and Attica*, pp. 118–119, quoted by Paley^2 2, p. 497.

[262] Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 228, (following Hermann's reading of ἀγκρεμασθῇ, which is also printed by Diggle): "ἀνακρεμάννυμι is, like ἀνατίθημι, a *vox propria* for dedication."

[263] The closest in meaning to superstructure may be LSJ, s. v. i, 8, 'portico', where cited, among other things, are *IG* XI (2) 161 D 118, a third-century BC building inscription from Delos, where its precise meaning is uncertain, but has to do with the roof, which would be part of the superstructure; and an "interpolation" in a manuscript of Heliodorus at 2. 26 (τε ἐμβόλων) in the midst of a generic list of topographical features at Delphi, in which case it could mean any number of things. So too Procopius (*Aed.* 3. 5. 11) uses ἔμβολον of a kind of gallery for sharpshooters atop a wall. These latter, however, are late sources and could possibly reflect a debasement in the meaning of the term.

[264] Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 199, with Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 150–151, and LSJ, s.v. i, 6. Paley^2 2, p. 458, translates "imposts" and suggests that the addition of τάδε implies that the tumbling effects were actually staged; Dodds (loc. cit.) disagrees, without mentioning Paley. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, p. 29, follows

the term in this way, especially when θριγκός, as we have seen, was available and more suitable as a generalized reference to a building's superstructure, if this was Euripides' intention. I suspect instead that these ἔμβολα are what are known from building inscriptions as ἐμπόλια, that is, the trapezoidal wooden seats that were embedded in the center of each column drum to receive wood or metal dowels for centering usually called πόλοι, but the name also may be used for the pegs or dowels themselves.[265] According to Dinsmoor, in rare instances, namely, two fourth-century BC buildings, the Tholos at Delphi and a portico or "prostoon" at Eleusis, all parts of the assembly (that is, both seats and pins) were made of bronze.[266] The most comprehensive epigraphical evidence for the use of *empolia* to center columns is *IG* II^2 1675, a set of detailed instructions from ca. 337/6 BC, which is associated with the building of the portico at Eleusis.[267] While the term ἐμπόλια does not occur outside of inscriptions, there is no reason to assume that Euripides' did not know of it at least in principle; furthermore, we have seen time and again how this playwright's technical language is paralleled in such inscriptions. If Euripides means by ἔμβολα *empolia*, with an inconsequential change of labial consonant, we should not expect the diminutive in tragedy.[268] The close proximity of "columns" to this term makes it all the more tempting to regard "empolia" as the correct translation of Euripides' ἔμβολα at *Ba.* 591.

A second Euripidean use of the term would seem to support this contention. At *Ph.* 114, admittedly a problematic line, κλῄθροις and ἔμβολα are mentioned together as parts of a mechanism for bolting a

Dodds, but with evident reluctance: "The ἔμβολα mentioned *Ba.* 591 are supposed to be the 'long cross-pieces which rest on the columns of the façade and compose the architrave' [Dodds, op. cit., p. 150]."

265 Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, pp. 171–172, with fig. 61, provides a detailed explanation of how *empolia* functioned. As if to demonstrate the confusion, LSJ *rev. suppl.*, s. v., corrects 'casing for dowel' with 'dowel'.

266 Dinsmoor 171, n. 3, who does not, however, cite evidence for the Tholos.

267 The contents of this inscription are clearly summarized by Davis, *Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions*, pp. 46–47; see also Jeppesen, *Paradeigmata*, p. 145, with fig. 83. Cf. *IG* II^2 1678. 6.

268 On the tragedians' general tendency to avoid diminutives, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 207, referring to the use of δώματα for "bedrooms" or "cubicula" at *HF* 955 where δωμάτια might be expected. Similarly, αἰθέρα Διὸς δωμάτιον at Ar. *Ra.* 100 and 311 is a spoof of E. fr. 487 (*Mel.S.*), according to Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, p. 203, since the diminutive δωμάτιον is of a type which is "alien to tragedy." But it is possible that Ar. is mocking E. here *for* his use of diminutives.

set of doors or gates.[269] Paley suggests: "By ἔμβολα there can be no doubt that either the bars (μοχλοί) are meant, which fastened the gates inside, or the βάλανος, the peg inserted to keep the bar fast in its socket."[270] It is significant that, in the earlier edition of his commentary, Paley had not mentioned the second possibility, which in fact accords better with the primary meaning of ἔμβολον, according to LSJ: "anything pointed so as to be easily thrust in, a peg, a stopper, linch-pin (masc.)"; apparently, he had reconsidered the matter by the time of the publication of the later edition.[271] Mastronarde translates ἔμβολα at *Ph.* 114: "simply 'things which are inserted', hence 'bars'," and a synonym for the more usual term, μοχλός, explaining: "Greek double-leaved gates could be routinely fastened to sill and lintel with vertical pins (sometimes in one leaf only, the other leaf being held in place by the offset of the sill and overlap of the pinned leaf), but for greater security a strong horizontal bar (μοχλός) was affixed across the leaves to the jambs."[272] Mastronarde considers but ultimately rejects what I would consider a more likely possibility: that κλήϑροις is equivalent to μοχλοῖς (the bar) and then ἔμβολα would equal βάλανοι (the metal pins).[273] However, he is right to deduce that ἔμβολον should indicate something that is able to be inserted. Among other pin, wedge, and peg-like items for which ἔμβολον serves usefully as a designation are the wax lynch-pins that the charioteer Myrtilos, bribed by Pelops, installed in the wheel apparatus of Oinomaos' chariot (*FGrHist* 3 [Pherekydes] F 37a), and the *membrum virile* in comedy.[274]

---

269 Diggle obelizes the entire line after ἆρα. Paley [2] 3, pp. 124–125 and Elizabeth Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1988), p. 177, review the textual problems and their scholarly history, none of which significantly affect the present argument, which involves the proper translation of ἔμβολα in this context; Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, pp. 184–185, discusses the meaning at greater length and updates the bibliography.

270 Paley [2] 3, p. 124.

271 Paley[1] 3, p. 122.

272 Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 184.

273 Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, pp. 184–185, who might have cited Hesychius' gloss, ἔμβολα· μοχλοί (E 2281–2308 Latte), in connection with *Ph.* 114, but Hsch. does add a generalizing ἀσφάλειαι, which suggests that he is simply interested in the fact that they have to do with security. Upon review of the technical possibilities, Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women*, p. 177, prefers to regard the expression, with some justification, "as a poetic hendiadys, linking ideas which are separable but not entirely distinct."

274 In the case of the latter the paradigm could just as easily be LSJ, s. v. i, 3: 'brazen beak, ram', as of a ship. For the sens. obsc., LSJ, s. v. i, 1, citing Ar. fr. 317 (= *PCG* III^2 fr. 334 [*Th. b*]); cf. Ar. *Av.* 1256 (στύομαι τριέμβολον) with Nan Dunbar, *Aristophanes Birds* (Oxford, 1995), p. 629, and Hsch., s. vv. ἔμβολον (which cites its use at Ar. fr. 334) and ἔμβολα, which cites E.'s use of the term in his *Palamedes* (fr. 590) and in his

Something of a like nature might be expected at *Ba.* 591, which would seem to eliminate the possibility that, in the plural, the term could mean "architrave."

On the other hand, as we have seen, Euripides' word choice is close enough to the technical architectural vocabulary found in inscriptions to suggest that it should be taken to mean the assembled parts of the *empolia*, allowing that tragic diction would not normally support the use of the diminutive form. If these ἔμβολα are meant to be the centering devices between the column drums, the dative κίοσιν could then be construed as some sort of comitative dative in that the columns (that is, the drums, their constituent parts) and the pins and *empolia* rendered visible by their collapse could be seen as reeling simultaneously to the chorus who are watching at close range. The fact that these *empolia* at first glance seem incongruously to be made of stone is not an impediment to this interpretation. That it is the ἔμβολα that are modified by λάϊνα could simply be an instance of hypallage or transferred epithet, where the adjective should perhaps more properly be applied to κίοσιν, where it would be expected. If so, and the cases were intended to be read as reversed and their syntaxes adjusted accordingly, with ἔμβολα in the dative and κίοσιν in the accusative, we would have "stony columns along with their *empolia*" reeling, which makes perfect sense. The architrave too, of course, could fall, but without mention by the chorus.

Since we left *Trojan Women*, the technical language associated with superstructures of buildings that we have been discussing has been primarily literal and descriptive, rather than figurative and metaphorical. We may now return to *Trojan Women*, where the language of architecture always functions both ways, and look at one of the most polyvalent of terms which have been applied to superstructures: κρήδεμνον. Hecuba has already used one architectural term, θριγκός (*Tr.* 489) to describe the peak or pinnacle of the physical and emotional debasement she is experiencing at the hands of her Greek captors. We are thus duly prepared when, slightly later, at vv. 506–509, another vexed and controversial passage, Hecuba, again turns to language with distinct architectural overtones, again with the sense of "crowning" or "capping," but far more suggestive, and elusive, in meaning.[275] The lines under considera-

---

satyr-play *Skiron* (fr. 681) but defines the term in the sens. obsc., which would be unlikely in tragedy, but acceptable in a satyr-play (E 2281–2308 Latte).

[275] Dianna Rhyan Kardulias, "Odysseus in Ino's Veil: Feminine Headdress and the Hero in *Odyssey* 5," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131 (2001), 23–51 (30,

tion read: ἄγετε τὸν ἁβρὸν δή ποτ' ἐν Τροίᾳ πόδα, / νῦν δ' ὄντα δοῦλον, στιβάδα πρὸς χαμαιπετῆ / πέτρινά τε κρήδεμν', ὡς πεσοῦσ' ἀποφθαρῶ / δακρύοις καταξανθεῖσα.[276] Translate: "Guide those feet which once were so delicate in Troy but are now the feet of a slave, so that I might fall headlong toward the padded earth that shall, with its stony crown, be my resting place, and perish at last, rent to shreds by my tears."

Commentators have struggled to ascertain where exactly Hecuba is asking to be led in these lines and what she intends to do once there. Tyrrell and Paley contend that she desires to be taken to the crest of some precipice where she may cast herself down after she weeps her fill, while Lee and Barlow prefer to believe that she is asking to return to the spot where she appears at the beginning of the play, there to dissolve in tears of resignation.[277] Werner Biehl bypasses the issue of physical movement altogether, suggesting rather that πόδα is a synecdoche, and that all of the passage's striking images are to be taken symbolically or figuratively rather than literally.[278] None of these views, to my mind, gets to the heart of the image. While the Greek is not as straightforward as the above translation suggests, the sense seems clear: Rather than changing location, Hecuba wishes that she might allow her body on the spot simply to drop to the ground, her head receiving its insulting "stony crown" as it strikes the earth hard, and there she will gladly perish from being torn to shreds, not by the rocks, as might be expected in this milieu, but by tears. While her request is genuine, it is unlikely that she harbors any real hope of her wish being fulfilled. The main point is that she is ready to do so. It is also just possible that Hecuba is referring both to the lowly domestic circumstances that are in store for her in Greece and, at the same time, to her grave, and longing for it, a *double entendre* that I have tried to preserve in my translation in the ambiguity of the phrase "resting place." In inscriptions, στιβάς, the locale towards which Hecuba wants to be lead, usually translated 'straw mat' or the like, can mean 'grave'.[279]

---

with n. 23), calls κρήδεμνον in Homer "a visible metaphor of intactness," citing its use of Troy's bastion at *Il.* 16. 100; *Od.* 13. 388; and of Nestor's wine jar at *Od.* 3. 392.

[276] Kovacs, *Euripides* 4, prints δέμνι', an emendation of Dobree, instead of ms. κρήδεμν'.

[277] Robert Y. Tyrrell, *The Troades of Euripides* (London, 1901), p. 79; Paley[2] 1, pp. 505–506, who notes as well that the language is Homeric, citing, e.g., Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα at *Il.* 16. 100; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 160; Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 182.

[278] Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, pp. 220–221.

[279] LSJ, s. v. i, 5; for the two inscriptions cited, one from Iasos and the other from Caria, no dates are put forward by the publisher, G. Cousin, "Inscriptions de Iasos et

The richly allusive term κρήδεμνον has two basic meanings: in the singular, a woman's headdress, its primary lexical force; and in the plural, the 'crown' of a city, its battlements, in metaphorical sense.[280] In the Hellenistic period city goddesses were personified as Tyche wearing a crown composed of towers and circuit walls, thereby conflating the two senses of κρήδεμνον, the most famous example being the Tyche of Antioch by Lysippos' pupil, Eutychides.[281] It is easy to understand the ancient association of crowns and battlements. First, they sit literally atop the head and the city, respectively, and second, they "adorn" the host with the proper message for outsiders, including potentially threatening ones.[282] For as Aristotle (*Pol.* 1331a) makes clear, walls were both an adornment (κόσμος) of the city and an effective means of protection against enemies. John McK. Camp outlines the ways in which the aesthetic properties of ancient walls may be appreciated: "Many Greek walls show all the concern for beauty of form and decoration we expect in a red-figured pot, a marble *kouros*, a well-cut inscription, or a silver coin. The care with which each block is finished, the use of varied coursing, the tooling of

de Bargylia," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 13 (1889), 23–40 (36–37); "Voyage en Carie," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 22 (1898), 361–402 (373); they are either fourth-century or Hellenistic.

280 According to LSJ, s. v.; an unusual extension of the metaphorical range of the term may be seen at *Od.* 3. 392, where it refers to the seal of Nestor's wine jar. A good point is made by Alfred Heubeck and Arie Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 2 (Oxford, 1989), p. 188 (ad loc. *Od.* 13. 388), who, questioning the term's aptness for its metaphorical application to the walls of city, argue that "the original meaning of κρήδεμνον" is not "veil" or "shawl" but "head-binding," citing examples of Bronze age depictions of ribbon-like diadems; this type of headgear, they suggest, would lend itself better to an image of "crowning;" cf. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition*, pp. 44–45. As a cautionary note, however, Nagler, op. cit., pp. 60–61, discusses the difficulties associated with the attempt to differentiate between the literal and the metaphorical usages of κρήδεμνον in Homer. For a fuller consideration of the linguistic history of the term, see Heubeck and Hoekstra, op. cit., pp. 187–188; for an extensive analysis of its Homeric occurrences, see Nagler, op. cit., pp. 10–11 and 44–63.

281 J.J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986), pp. 2–3, with fig. 1.

282 Cf. Kardulias, "Odysseus in Ino's Veil," p. 31, on headdress-wearers in the *Odyssey*: "Taken together, goddesses who have the upper hand, promiscuous maids, and Nausikaa's skittish retinue serve to remind us that the κρήδεμνον is endowed with both apotropaic and alluring qualities at the same time, as the gleam of glossy veils invites the eye yet reflects [*sic*] scrutiny." Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition*, pp. 44–63, also emphasizes the "chastity" aspect of the term's use in Homer. Charles Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow. Art, Gender, and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus, and Hecuba* (Durham and London, 1993), p. 173, discussing *Hec.* 905 ff., focuses on the sexual overtones of this conflation of headdresses and battlements, noting: "The image of the city 'shorn of its crown of towers' immediately establishes the analogy between the (figurative) rape of the city and the actual violation of its women."

the surfaces, and the decorative effect of polychromy belong to the same aesthetic milieu which we admire in other forms of artistic expression among the Greeks."[283] Robert L. Scranton, in a discussion of the Aristotle passage and the ways in which ancient walls may have been made beautiful, points to on an unusual, potentially decorative feature called the "indented trace" that is exclusive to certain Mycenaean walls, while Camp further speculates that the decorative patterning effect achieved by the mixing of light and dark stone which characterizes the recently discovered fortification wall at Stageira, Aristotle's home town, possibly inspired the latter's notion of the wall as an adornment to the city.[284]

Both of these associations, adornment and protection, are resident in the πέτρινά τε κρήδεμν' of *Tr.* 508, not to mention the stony ground of the earth that Hecuba's head will strike as she falls. There can be no mistaking that at least one of the referents for the phrase, as some commentators have noted, are the battlements atop the famed Trojan fortification walls, the very ones from which her grandson, Astyanax, will be thrown, and the same ones that he will not, as fate would have it, live to re-erect (*Tr.* 1160–1161).[285] Thus, the proximity of πέτρινά τε κρήδεμν' to the image of Hecuba's body torn to shreds figuratively by tears serves as a poignant foreshadowing of the literal fate of the boy's body which will actually be torn to shreds by protruding rocks as it falls from the ramparts and hits the unforgiving ground. (The violent image of *Ion* 1267, where Ion instructs that Creusa be hurled from the peaks of Parnassus, whose ridges would "comb or card" [καταξήνωσι] the unsullied hairs on her head as she falls, might be compared.) That this is meant is reinforced by *Tr.* 783–784, where the battlements to which Astyanax is led are called πατρῴων / πύργων … ἄκρας στεφάνας ("the high crowns of the patriarchic towers"), with one word for "crown" (στεφάνη) substituted for another (κρήδεμνον), as is the case at *Hec.* 910–912 (ἀπὸ δὲ στεφάναν κέκαρσαι πύργων …, "you are shorn of your crown of towers"). In the latter, there is a further hint of the stain

283 Camp, "Walls and the *Polis*," p. 44.

284 Robert L. Scranton, *Greek Walls* (Cambridge, MA, 1941), pp. 13–15 and 151; Camp, "Walls and the *Polis*," p. 44.

285 Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 182; curiously, Davidson, "Homer and Euripides' *Troades*," p. 67, who quotes Barlow's remarks on this passage in full, considers this suggestion "perhaps far-fetched," but, "nevertheless, … ingenious." Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 221, does not entertain any other alternative for the "poet. Plural" κρήδεμνα than as a reference to a noblewoman's headgear, calling the image "katachrestisch bzw. euphemistisch."

of human blood to come, even though smoke (αἰθάλου) is the nominal impetus for the chorus' lament: … κατὰ δ' … κηλῖδ' οἰκτροτάταν κέχρωσαι ("you are colored with most pitiful stains," *Hec.* 911–912).[286]

There is a deep irony behind the circumstances of the untimely death of Hector's only child. The τείχη πατρῷα, Λοξίου πυργώματα deemed responsible (*Tr.* 1174) should have protected the boy; instead, his life was "cut short" (ἔκειρεν) at these very walls, his head crushed, even as his mother, Andromache, had once cut and groomed the boy's hair—images that are eerily foreshadowed in the καταξανθεῖσα of *Tr.* 509.[287] The other kind of κρήδεμνον, a woman's headdress, similarly is meant to function both as an adornment for her person as well as a veil with which to symbolize her unavailability, that is, as a form of protection against unwanted male attention. That function too is inverted with brutal force at *Tr.* 506–509. As a symbol of her debasement, Hecuba's "crown" will be the dull thud with which her head strikes the ground. In this light, the choice of καταξαίνω, a verb otherwise used of the carding or combing of wool, to image the shredding of Hecuba's body seems to enhance further the distinctly feminine cast of the queen's plea.

The implied shredding of Hecuba's body prefiguring the real shredding of Astyanax' finds its natural place among the ever-present reminders that complete annihilation of a great civilization is a major theme of *Trojan Women*: Torn bodies echo ravaged buildings and both signify lives and reputations wrenched from their foundations and reduced to detritus. Everything here is in tatters. The extent to which the language of *Trojan Women* continually reinforces the visual impression of destruction is evident even in oblique examples such as the unusual expression "in ruins of peploi" (ἐν πέπλων ἐρειπίοις) which Hecuba uses of Helen's garments in a tirade addressed to the woman herself at *Tr.* 1025. Both Robert Y. Tyrrell and Lee comment on the striking usage of the plural form of the noun ἐρείπια to refer to clothes, although neither draws the analogy with the ruins of Troy.[288] The term is

---

[286] For walls and towers as "crowns" of cities, cf., e.g., Anacr. fr. 391 (*PMG*) and Pi. *O.* 8. 32–33, while at 33–36, the burning towers of Troy billow forth smoke.

[287] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 261, on *Tr.* 1174: "Euripides stresses the cause of Astyanax's death for the sake of irony. The walls of his own city, which we would expect to be the boy's defence, brought about his death"; cf. Dyson and Lee, "The Funeral of Astyanax," pp. 26–27.

[288] Tyrrell, *The Troades of Euripides*, p. 104; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 241; Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 213, calls these ἐρείπια " 'fragments' of garments, or literally 'wreckage'." Rehm, *The Play of Space*, pp. 248–249, observes something similar of Xerxes' appearance in rags in A. *Pers.*: "the tyrant's clothes are a symbol. … [C]lothes are

commonly used of the wreckage or ruins of more substantial physical commodities, usually built structures such as, for example, in Hdt. 2. 154.5 (dwellings) and 4, 124. 1 (walls), Paus. 10. 38. 13 (sanctuary of Asclepius), A. *Pers.* 425 (wrecked ships), S. *Aj.* 308 (more unusually, of corpses) and at Euripides' own *Bacchae* 7 (houses).[289]

Hecuba had earlier upbraided Helen for her hubristically luxurious tastes (*Tr.* 996–997). With her cynical suggestion that Helen should be walking around in rags rather than in the finery that she actually wears, Hecuba publicly airs the notion that the dress of her who brought down Troy should by rights reflect the city's own shattered appearance, and, in effect, strips the guilty woman of her dangerous and deadly façade in front of all. Just as Helen's luxurious appearance had been both a beneficiary and a reflection of Troy's prosperity, so now too her appearance should suffer appropriately by reflecting the current and future state of the great city she has succeeded in destroying. For Hecuba, Helen is no less than a city-sacker. In a trio of staccato accusations at *Tr.* 891–893 that linguistically recall the etymology famously certified by Euripides' predecessor, Aeschylus, at *Ag.* 689–690 (ἑλένας ἕλανδρος ἑλέπτολις), Helen is held by Hecuba to be fully capable of the typically masculine prerogative of "sacking cities" and "burning houses."[290] The lines are addressed to Menelaus: ὁρᾶν δὲ τήνδε φεῦγε, μή σ' ἕλῃ πόθῳ. / αἱρεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματ', ἐξαιρεῖ πόλεις, / πίμπρησιν οἴκους· ("Avoid looking at her, lest she seize you with desire. For she captures men's eyes, she destroys cities, she burns houses."). Euripides, perhaps so as to be seen as emulating not imitating, puns on the present forms of the verb rather than the aorist, though he is careful to introduce his tricolon with Aeschylus' verb. Compare *Or.* 1386–1387: Λήδας / σκύμνον Δυσελέναν Δυσελέναν ("whelp of Leda, IllHelen, IllHelen"). Meanwhile, a far less derogatory etymology

---

extensions of the body, and when Xerxes responds to the disaster at Salamis by rending his garments, he registers the empire's destruction on his own person. … Xerxes' return in rags offers an effective theatrical image of his shredded empire …".

289 Scolia at *Pers.* 425 (θραύσμασίν τ' ἐρειπίων) note that the term is normally used of the ruins of houses (W. Dindorf, *Aeschylus Tragoediae Superstites et Deperditarum Fragmenta*, 3: *Scholia Graeca ex Codicibus Aucta et Emendata* [1851; repr. Hildesheim, 1962], pp. 458–459, ad loc.). Although the use of ἐρείπια for clothing is certainly peculiar and uncommon, it is not unparalleled; cf. *TrGF* 2 (Adesp.) F 7 (*Niobe*): λεπτοσπαθήτων χλανιδίων ἐρειπίοις θάλπουσα καὶ ψύχουσα …; Plutarch (*Quaest. Conv.* 691 D), who quotes the passage, reveals that the context is the nurse's care of Niobe's children. That the metaphor was familiar to the audience of *Tr.* seems unlikely, however, in light of the apparent rarity of its use.

290 Cf. Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 209.

for Helen's name is proposed in the play that is favorable to her; at *Hel.* 1674–1675, Ἑλένη = κλοπαία ("stolen one"). Helen is, however, not the only woman in *Trojan Women* who is capable of sacking cities. At *Tr.* 359–360, 364, and 461 Cassandra warns that she will "sack" (κἀντιπορθήσω, and so forth) the house of Agamemnon in retribution for the deaths of her father and brother; at vv. 365–366 she promises that soon the fate of Troy will seem blessed beside the fate of the Greeks.

τοῖχος/τεῖχος

For the reader who is willing to accept that a web of intertextual imagery, the byproduct of a continual barrage of architecturally inflected language, lies beneath the surface of *Trojan Women*, a particularly striking use of τοῖχος, to which we now turn, becomes less obscure. *Tr.* 118 is another "difficult passage" that has confounded critics and translators.[291] When we first encounter Hecuba in the play, she is on the ground, prostrate in grief. Tabulating the ingredients of her suffering and the circumstances that have led to her current degraded state, Hecuba uses the commonest term for built walls, τοῖχος, in the plural, to refer to the sides of her own body, as she expresses a wish to roll round and round in a paroxysm of lamentation. The relevant part of the passage is as follows: ὥς μοι πόθος εἱλίξαι/καὶ διαδοῦναι νῶτον ἄκανθάν τ'/εἰς ἀμφοτέρους τοίχους μελέων,/ἐπιοῦσ' αἰεὶ δακρύων ἐλέγους ("how I have a desire to twist and turn and to shift the weight of my back and my spine to alternate sides of my body, all the while rehearsing elegies of tears," *Tr.* 116–119).[292] Based upon the context of the song in which it occurs, most have assumed τοίχους, to be an allusion to the sides of a ship (LSJ, s. v. i, 2), out of deference to the nautical metaphor which precedes it at *Tr.* 102–104 and the nautical imagery which immediately follows, although, for all of her apparent expertise, the woman admits to never having been aboard a ship (*Tr.* 686). Hecuba's unusual sentiment is thereby presumed to be inspired by yet another nautical metaphor in which the physical act of rolling one's body back and forth in agony is allied with a ship's

[291] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 83.

[292] The conjecture of ἐπιδοῦσ' for Musgrave's ἐπιοῦσ' by Michael Gronewald, "Konjekturen und Erläuterungen zur Hekabe und zu den Troades des Euripides," *Rheinisches Museum* 132 (1989), 221–223 (222), does not affect the present interpretation.

motion at sea.[293] Hence, Barlow: "Hecuba is envisaged here as rocking her body from side to side as if, she implies, she were a ship in motion on the waves." She adds: "The submerged metaphor here is psychologically revealing again of the old woman's preoccupation with ships."[294] Biehl holds that "τοῖχοι sind die Bordwände des Schiffes."[295] Lee is even more specific: "Her back (νῶτον ἄκανθάν τ') is the keel, while her sides (ἀμφοτέρους τοίχους) are the sides of the vessel."[296] Barlow further suggests that the use of τοίχους in this passage is "ambiguous" and that its occurrence here constitutes "the only instance of the word's metaphorical use."[297] Kurtz admits that he knows of no other comparable image "[i]n der ganzen frühgriechischen Literatur" of a person comparing his or her body to a ship.[298] Upon further consideration, Barlow introduces the possibility that Hecuba may not in fact be speaking metaphorically in this passage: "Is it a metaphor? To Hecuba who is beyond fine distinctions between the waking world and the imagination, it may well not be." Rather, at this point, the queen may be seen to have progressed from the "traditional figurative language" at the beginning of her song "to the literal belief that she is actually on a ship."[299]

Certainly there is sufficient ancient evidence to demonstrate that the word τοῖχος (or, alternatively, τεῖχος), usually in the plural, served as a colloquial term for the "walls," that is, the hull, of a ship. An example close to hand may be found at Euripides' own *Helen* 1573, when the armed men accompanying the secretly reunited couple, Helen and Menelaus, on a surreptitious trip back to Greece array themselves on either side of the ship's τοίχους. At Aristophanes' *Frogs* 537 the term appears in a proverbial expression that borrows the image of seeking out the safer side (τοῖχος) of a ship in distress in an ancient version, it would seem, of our own "looking out for Number One," or "waiting to see which way the

---

293 In addition to those discussed, cf. Tyrrell, *The Troades of Euripides*, pp. 58–59; Paley[2] 1, p. 483. Translations, too, sometimes reflect this interpretation, e.g., Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4, p. 25: "How I long to roll my back and spine about, listing now to this side of my body, now to that as I utter continually my tearful song of woe!" Craik, "Sexual Imagery and Innuendo in *Troades*," associates the frequent nautical language and themes with sexual imagery, which she sees as a conspicuous undercurrent of the play.

294 Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 163.

295 Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 133.

296 Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 83.

297 Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 51, with n. 43, following, as she says, Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache*, p. 145: "das Bild ist neu."

298 Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 222.

299 Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 51–52 and 105.

wind blows," as the mention of Theramenes, the slippery Athenian politician of the late fifth-century, at *Ra.* 541 makes clear.[300] Scholia to *Ra.* 537 reinforce this interpretation, and quote Euripides' fr. 89 (*Alcmene*) which also contains the proverb. These are relatively straightforward examples, however, which do not contribute much toward our understanding of *Tr.* 118.

On the other hand, the examples from the *Iliad*, where the great majority of occurrences of the term for the sides of a ship occur, are worth considering for the ambiguity or polyvalence implied and the whiff of metaphor that seems to be preserved.[301] At *Il.* 15. 382 a battle is ensuing at the ships of the Achaeans, which lie beached behind a newly erected wall that has just been stormed and reduced to ruins (vv. 359–366) by the Trojans led on by Apollo. A simile (vv. 381–386) compares the onslaught of the Trojan forces as they easily transgress the ramparts with huge, wind-driven waves crashing "over the walls of a ship" (νηὸς ὑπὲρ τοίχων). Meanwhile, the shocked Achaeans, the wall that was supposed to protect the fleet reduced to rubble, retreat to their *actual* ships. On account of the context, it is virtually impossible not to regard τοῖχος in v. 382 as an allusion to both kinds of walls. Likewise, at *Il.* 14. 32 (compare 7. 449), where τεῖχος appears again in reference to the wall erected directly against the sterns (ἐπὶ πρύμνῃσιν) of the beached ships, it seems to stand as much for the actual wall as for the "wall" of ships that it conceals from view. The Greeks, as we have seen, will in fact be forced to fight from their ships once their wall fails, relying on the vessels' massed sterns in lieu of real fortifications. When, finally, at *Il.* 24. 443 the reconstituted wall in front of the ships is called reductively the "towers of ships" (πύργους τε νεῶν), the congruence of the two as concept and as reality is complete.

That Hecuba has seagoing vessels in mind at the very beginning of *Trojan Women* is not surprising; she and her fellow Trojan women will soon be sailing for Greece as war booty. And yet, as the audience knows, and the chorus hope for, at vv. 1100–1117, Greeks too will suffer and die on these same seas on their ostensibly happier journey home, a

[300] Cf. Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, p. 262.

[301] The term's appearance at *Od.* 12. 420 in reference to the hull of a ship is unambiguous. Bruno Gentili, *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*, trans. with intro. A. Thomas Cole (Baltimore, MD, and London, 1988), p. 210, in the context of a discussion of the "ship of state" allegory in Lyric poetry, notes there as well "the ambivalence of *toîchos*—'city wall' and 'sides of a ship.'"

theme iterated throughout the play.[302] The use of ἀμφοτέρους ("both") to modify τοίχους at *Tr.* 118 suggests that she means in some sense the walls of ships. It is also just possible that Hecuba's expression may partake of something of the proverbial usage of τοῖχος, of which Euripides was apparently well aware. She could be hinting that she is looking for a safe side, that is, a respite or even a reprieve from her fate, while realizing that her present circumstances are such as to make seeking one side of a ship or another a losing proposition; either way, she will still be on board bound for the homeland of the man who slew so many of her sons. Yet her situation is too tragic, it would seem, to be summarized with a well-worn proverb more appropriate for the comic stage. Given the prominence of architecture in word and image in this play, the allusion to the walls of the city would have been difficult to miss in Hecuba's wish. The audience has been primed to keep the walls in mind since the very first words of the prologue. We have seen that walls and the like are sometimes used metaphorically to refer to humans. There can be no mistaking that Hecuba's degraded status mimics that of her city's fortification walls. She, the wife of a king, mother of princes and, above all, the mother of Hector, is justified in considering herself a bulwark of the city that has been obscenely breached. Two passages from Sophocles which suggest that a torn, ruined body and/or soul was metaphorically equivalent to a sacked city might be cited in support of my interpretation of *Tr.* 118. At *Women of Trachis* 1103–1104 Heracles speaks of his body as both "shredded into rags" (κατερρακωμένος) and "sacked" (ἐκπεπόρθημαι) in close succession. And at *Ajax* 896 Tecmessa, in her distress at finding Ajax dead, exclaims: διαπεπόρθημαι ("I have been sacked").

In addition to these allusions, it is also possible that Hecuba's choice of language betrays that she is imagining as well the walls of her future tomb. For this it might be useful to compare another surprising and unusual use of τοῖχος, this time, in the form of a compound adjective, at Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1539. The chorus of Argive elders bewail the ignominious circumstances of the death of their lord, Agamemnon, wishing that they had died before witnessing it: ἰὼ γᾶ γᾶ, εἴθε μ' ἐδέξω / πρὶν τόνδ' ἐπιδεῖν ἀργυροτοίχου / δροίτας κατέχοντα χάμευναν ("Alas, O earth, earth, if only you had received me before I had to look upon this man possessing

[302] Cf. Halleran, *Stagecraft in Euripides*, p. 93, who sees this irony reflected in the "frequent references to the Greeks' sailing home and the many nautical images." On the significance of nautical imagery in *Tr.*, see also Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 117–119.

a pallet-bed in the form of a silver-walled tub as a grave," vv. 1537–1540). While no word for grave is mentioned, the verb κατέχω ("possess"), which is traditionally used in reference to what the earth does to a buried body or of the body's relationship with its grave (cf. *Ag.* 454), has unmistakable funerary implications.[303] In this case the sumptuous walls of the royal bathtub in which Agamemnon met his death at the hands of his wife elide with the humbler periboloi of the shaft grave or tholos tomb. Hecuba, too, herself a queen, may be thinking of walls of this sort. In both instances the ignominy of their respective situations is at the forefront of the sentiments.

Finally, it is possible that an audience of Athenians listening to the play in 415 BC, with the collective agitation surrounding the issue of sending their navy to Sicily under way (a historical event that has often been associated with *Trojan Women*),[304] might also have been reminded of an earlier historical occasion when city walls and the wooden hulls of ships were confused or conflated, as at *Tr.* 118. I refer to the famous second oracle offered up by Delphi to the Athenians who came in search of an answer to the question of how to go about defending their land against the Persians in 480, as told by Herodotus (7. 141–143). The mysterious expression ξύλινον τεῖχος ("wooden wall") of the oracle was taken by some to refer to an ancient wall of the acropolis, which should then be occupied for a promised successful defense, or so this group surmised. Others, however, led by an up-and-coming politician named Themistocles, correctly interpreted the expression to refer to the wooden wall τᾶς νέας ("of a ship") and thus found in the oracle an injunction to abandon the acropolis and outfit a fleet with a prophecy of a definitive sea victory at Salamis. There could be no more pointed illustration that the "fortification" aspect of the word τεῖχος was never entirely absent for an Athenian ear even when ships' hulls instead of city walls are meant. This famous oracle also demonstrates beyond the shadow of a doubt the ever-present potential for ambiguity innate in the word, in whatever context it appears.

Themistocles himself makes clear that the exchange of city walls for ships' walls was an even one when he rebukes the Corinthian, Adeimantus, who has just insulted him with the epithet ἄπολις ἀνήρ ("man with-

---

303 On this use of the verb, see Albert Henrichs, "The Tomb of Aias and the Prospect of Hero Cult in Sophokles," *Classical Antiquity* 12 (1993), 165–180 (174).

304 Ruth Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Hypomnemata) 60 (Göttingen, 1980), p. 139; Grube, *The Drama of Euripides*, pp. 280–281.

out a city")—a reference to the recent Persian sack of Athens—with the following (Hdt. 8. 61): "Both our city and our land will be greater than yours as long as there are two hundred warships plying the seas." This historical moment might also lie behind Sophocles' linkage of walls and ships as parallel symbols of the securely bounded, symbiotic environs in which civilized men operate at *Oedipus the King* 56–57, a passage mentioned earlier in the chapter: "Neither tower (read: walls) nor ship amounts to anything if devoid of the men who dwell inside" (ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς / ἐρῆμος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω).[305] The times were such in Athens that, before the Sicilian debacle, fortification walls and ships' walls were equally potent symbols of strength and efficacy, neither of which Hecuba in Euripides' play is in possession of in her present plight. Her desperate rolling motion from wall to wall reflects her hopeless relationship with the familiar former guarantors of her pampered lifestyle. Now, however, neither ships' nor circuit walls, Greek or Trojan, can afford her any succor.

A detailed overview of architectural terminology in *Trojan Women* and throughout the corpus of Euripides has revealed the many ways in which the playwright regularly exploits this kind of language for descriptive vividness as well as poetic and dramatic effect. While Euripides gives evident attention to the subtle distinctions between the structural and the decorative parts of buildings, which, as we have seen, include references and allusions to the discrete components of foundations, steps, stylobate, colonnade, walls, porches, antae, entablature, frieze, pediment, and roof, his use of terminology remains elastic and, on occasion, inconsistent. It is well to remember that modern usage of ancient architectural vocabulary, while based closely upon perceived patterns of ancient usage, is not only conventional but also far more circumscribed than in ancient times. Moreover, there is no reason to expect dramatic language, even of a technical sort, to submit to a rigidity of application comparable to that of modern architectural historians. Yet, while Euripides' use of architectural language may be neither as precise nor as consistent as a modern-day expert might prefer, it is always colorful, imaginative, and surprising, and it makes a substantive contribution to the reputed realism in his works. In brief his knowledge of architectural components may be imperfect, but it is nonetheless impressive in its breadth, depth, and flexibility. Thus,

[305] Towers and ships' hulls are again linked, along with wealth, as symbols of mortal power that are nonetheless ineffectual against fate at S. *Ant*. 953–954.

despite a few lapses in consistency and rigor, Euripides' technical vocabulary and the ingenuity of its handling constitute an efficient tool for the generation of effective imagery throughout the plays. In this he once again distinguishes himself from both Aeschylus and Sophocles. Finally, in a significant number of instances, we have found that Euripides' technical language is paralleled in building inscriptions, prose writers, and later lexica and compilations rather than in the works of other poets and playwrights, as might be expected, thereby giving this language what I have called a "prosaic" rather than a "poetic" impetus, and suggesting what cannot be proven, that the playwright, in his quest for authenticity, local color, and realistic effect, might have researched the architect's trade firsthand.

"Cyclopean" Masonry

Before concluding our discussion of architecturally inflected language in Euripides, we turn to two further linguistically based motifs that recur periodically enough throughout the extant corpus to merit our attention. Thus far we have encountered relatively few references or allusions to actual, specified monuments or archaeological features, and even in those rare cases where commentators are able to propose a real-life object as the source of inspiration (e.g., *IT* 962; *El.* 706–707),[306] the authority of the description is more or less compromised by an ambiguous conflation of past and present—the habit of poets (blessedly), it would seem. This is in essence also the conclusion of Easterling, although she does not discuss monuments per se, who observes that even Euripides' scholiasts occasionally "find fault with him for 'combining his own period with that of the heroes and mixing up the times' [a translation of a scholion on *Hec.* 254]." Easterling's "heroic manner" and "a certain heroic vagueness," accurately, I believe, capture the archaeological "mood" of Euripidean tragedy.[307] Strictly speaking, such references are not within the purview of the present study, which does not set out to be an "archaeology" of Euripides but rather focuses on his visual language.

[306] See p. 33, above.
[307] P.E. Easterling, "Anachronism in Greek Tragedy," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985), 1–10 (7–10).

To be sure, the whole question of anachronism in tragedy is a highly debated and still unsettled subject. In most cases it is impossible to know whether a contemporary (i.e., Archaic or Classical) monument is being evoked or some indeterminate, generic Bronze age precedent, wherein knowledge in Euripides' day was understandably less than in our own, with archaeology a proper field of study, and moreover would have been heavily mediated through Homer and other early poetry. The well known choric descriptions of the decorations of the temple of Apollo at Delphi in *Ion*, which do not correspond unequivocally with any of the six temples of Pausanias' account of the history of building on this site, provide a good example of a more or less imaginary re-creation of an "ancient" monument that is appropriate for the time frame of the play; we shall undertake a full discussion of the ekphrasis in Chapter Four.

There is no problem with anachronism, however, in the case of Euripides' fondness for the term "Cyclopean" in reference to the distinctive masonry style of the Bronze age, best known from the preserved remains of Tiryns and Mycenae in the Argolid. The term occurs as an epithet for walls and/or, as such, a metonym for a major Bronze age city at *IA* 265, 534, 1501; *HF* 15, 944, 998; *El.* 1158; *Tr.* 1088; *Or.* 965; *IT* 845. In addition the "foundations" of the Cyclopean walls of Argos are most likely meant by the Κυκλώπων … θυμέλας of *IA* 152.[308] The only other appearance of the epithet "Cyclopean" among the extant works of the major tragedians occurs at Sophocles' fr. 227 (*Her.*) (*TrGF* 4). Not only is it one of Euripides' most archaeologically correct images, but the playwright himself appears to have popularized the term in the Classical period as an epithet for Bronze age walls. The epithet "Cyclopean" persists as the standard term used by archaeologists for a style of Bronze age masonry that is exclusive to the Greek mainland.[309]

---

308 As both G. Robert, "Zur Theaterfrage," *Hermes* 32 (1897), 421–453 (440), and Paley² 3, p. 463, believe, although "hearth of the Cyclops" as a way of characterizing the city with which they were most closely associated is not out of the question; cf. A. Gow, "On the Meaning of the Word ΘΥΜΕΛΗ," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 32 (1912), 213–238 (220), who contends that a hearth is meant, whether real or merely suggestive. A similar conflation may occur at *Rh.* 235, where both "hearth" and "foundations" are appropriate when speaking of Troy as one's home; the latter sense is probably intended to be dominant, considering the use of the plural and the fact that the walls had just been mentioned at *Rh.* 232. Robert, loc. cit., allows for the extension of the meaning of θυμέλαι to include that which the stylobate carries, such as walls or, in the case of *El.* 713, a cella; LSJ, s. v., however, does not acknowledge this definition.

309 E.g., N. Claire Loader, *Building in Cyclopean Masonry. With Special Reference to the Mycenaean Fortifications on Mainland Greece* (Jonsered, Sweden, 1998); note the title of

In his commentary on Pausanias, J.G. Frazer distinguishes three styles of masonry at Mycenae: (1) the "Cyclopean," which consists of "roughly hewn blocks of grey hard limestone being piled upon each other without order and bonded by small stones and clay," as at Tiryns; (2) ashlar masonry, where "the stones are carefully hewn in oblong rectangular blocks and are laid in regular horizontal layers, with studied variation in the vertical joints;" and (3) "finely joined polygonal masonry,"[310] the last, a reference to the use of irregular building blocks of various sizes fitted together in the manner of a jigsaw puzzle. (One of the most spectacular examples of this type of masonry is not Bronze age, but Classical: the retaining wall of the temple of Apollo at Delphi.[311]) In point of fact, however, modern usage is far more generalized, and would not necessarily reserve the use of "Cyclopean" solely for the first type.[312] It seems likely that ancient usage was even more imprecise. Pausanias (2. 16. 5), as we shall see, calls both the circuit walls and the Lions Gate "works of the Cyclopes," although his description of the wall of Tiryns at 2. 25. 8 does match Frazer's definition of "true" Cyclopean masonry. At any rate it will not be necessary to hold Euripides to such a high level of technological accuracy and consistency. For him it is enough that the epithet "Cyclopean" constituted an image resonant with antiquity, myth,

---

a study by Edward Dodwell, one of the earliest modern European travelers to Greece: *Views and Descriptions of Cyclopian or Pelasgic Remains in Greece and Italy* (London, 1834).

[310] Frazer, 3, p. 99.

[311] Further refinements and subdivisions of these broad categories become necessary when the masonry of the Archaic and Classical periods and later is included. Camp, "Walls and the *Polis*," p. 42, one of the more recent to address the subject, lists five distinct ancient masonry styles: Lesbian or curved polygonal, polygonal, trapezoidal, ashlar, and pseudo-isodomic. These are roughly the distinctions maintained by Scranton, *Greek Walls*, pp. 23–24 and passim, in a classic study that does not, however, assess the Bronze age in a significant way.

[312] E.g., Reynold Higgins, *Minoan and Mycenaean Art* (1967; new rev. ed. London, 1997), p. 8, who seems to be referring to the (ashlar) masonry that surrounds the Lions Gate when he uses the term "Cyclopean Walls." Loader, *Building in Cyclopean Masonry*, p. 5, however, in a recent study of this style of masonry, calls for a new rigor in restricting the use of the term to the following: "Cyclopean masonry is specific to mainland Greece, being a stonework composed of two distinct wall faces of large, unhewn blocks, generally of local limestone and assembled without mortar, but where openings existed they were filled with small stones. Outer faces were built with the largest available blocks and fitted so as to appear solid and monumental. Sometimes the blocks of the inner face were smaller than those of the exterior face, but were positioned in a similar manner. The two faces are separated by an inner fill of earth and small stones which is unbroken throughout the circuit length."

and an inherited, collective memory of a time when men were larger-than-life and Herculean fortification efforts were required if cities were to survive wars between such men. Euripides would have been quite familiar with how one of these larger-than-life men, Hector, at *Il.* 12. 445–449, easily lifts a stone with a capacity of strength worthy of the Cyclopes, a wonder to "such mortals as we have today."

While some have argued that the style originated in Hittite Anatolia and elsewhere in the Near East, N. Claire Loader, in a recent, in-depth study of Cyclopean masonry, makes a strong case for its origins in the Argolid itself.[313] The thesis that the style is indigenous rather than borrowed melds well with the history of what might be called "viewer reception" of the walls, as far as can be determined. The construction of mainland Bronze age fortification walls, whose expert craftsmanship could be examined in Athens and elsewhere in the fifth century BC, appears to have been mythologized from an early date. Archaeological evidence suggests that this masonry style had awed and intimidated (or, in the words of Jeffrey Hurwit, "depressed and denigrated") the Greeks of the Dark age, who stood little chance of recovering the technology or the level of wealth necessary to replicate impressive fortifications like these until the Late Geometric period, when the style was deliberately imitated at a couple of sites in the Argolid.[314] The tradition that the gods had a hand in the creation of these most ancient of surviving fortification walls, as in the prologue of *Trojan Women*, is at least as old as Homer (*Il.* 21. 446–447), but almost certainly much older.[315] In *h. Merc.* 41–54 Hermes, working like a sculptor,[316] fashions the first lyre (cf. S. fr. 314. 284–328 [*Ichneutai*] [*TrGF* 4]), which, when turned over for lessons to Amphion (one of the twin sons of Zeus and Antiope), who adds three more strings, will be used by Amphion to charm the stones into place as seven-gated Thebes is magically walled. Euripides appears to have been especially

---

313 For the earlier view, see, e.g., Sp. Iakovidis, "Cyclopean Walls," *Athens Annals of Archaeology* 3 (1969), 468–472 (472); Loader, *Building in Cyclopean Masonry*, pp. 3 and 152–163.

314 Jeffrey M. Hurwit, *The Art and Culture of Early Greece, 1100–480 B. C.* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1985), pp. 120–121, with n. 70. Loader, *Building in Cyclopean Masonry*, pp. 5, 21, with references, and 41, emphasizes that, as visible signs of wealth, prosperity, power, and invincibility, Cyclopean walls served a symbolic as well as a functional role for the city.

315 Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City*, pp. 150–152, discusses the relationship of divinity and magic with walls in the Ancient Near East, with relevant bibliography.

316 Richard W. Johnston, "Hermes the Chiseler" (abstract), *American Journal of Archaeology* 103 (1999). 299.

taken with this appealing tale and may, in fact, have been its innovator; he has Hermes foretell the building feat at the end of his fragmentary play, *Antiope* (fr. 223. 90–95); it is mentioned, as well, at *Ph.* 823–824 and alluded to at *Ph.* 115 (λαϊνέοισον Ἀμφίονος ὀργάνοις) and again in the fragmentary *Hypsipyle* (fr. 752 f. 32–33).

The story is also told by later writers, among them, Apollodorus (3. 5. 5), Apollonius of Rhodes (1. 735–741), and Pausanias (9. 5. 7–8), who reports that "the poet who wrote the *Europa*"[317] claimed that Amphion was taught by Hermes and that his songs led forth stones and wild animals, the only known source for the myth which may precede Euripides' telling.[318] Homer (*Od.* 11. 262–264) attributes the fortifications at Thebes to both sons of Zeus and Antiope, Amphion and Zethus, although he does not mention the magical music-making. In the colorful version offered by Apollonius (1. 735–741), Zethus struggles to manage a huge chunk of mountain on his shoulders, while his brother charms along a rock twice the size with his music, an addition to the story that Frazer ingeniously interprets as an intention "to suggest the feebleness of brute strength by comparison with the power of genius."[319] The humorous proverb preserved in Alcaeus fr. 344 (Voigt) (cf. Sappho fr. 145 [Voigt]) comes to mind: "This I know for certain, that if a man moves gravel (χέραδος), stone that is not safely workable, he will probably get a sore head."[320] The brothers and their story were renowned, not the least, it seems, because of Euripides' drama: Pausanias in Thebes (9. 17. 4) points out the brothers' tomb, which is referred to at least on two other occasions by Euripides, *Ph.* 145 and *Supp.* 663, as well as at Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* 528.

Music and walls would seem to be strange bedfellows, yet they were linked in ancient times by a common capacity to inspire awe, the one to the ear and the other to the eye. The power and influence of music in classical antiquity need not be belabored; its effects are perfectly encapsulated, for instance, when the god of war puts aside his spears and

[317] Eumelus, fr. 13 *PEG*; Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, p. 487.

[318] Gantz, ibid, however, argues not entirely convincingly that this version of the building of the walls of Thebes appeared earlier in the *Ehoiai*, while A.C. Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae* (Cambridge, Eng., 1909), p. 141 (ad. loc. *Ph.* 824), dismissing the evidence of Pausanias as a "doubtful reference," prefers to believe that "Euripides is the earliest authority extant for the story of the walls of Thebes rising to the music of Amphion's lyre."

[319] *Apollodorus. The Library*, 1 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1967), p. 339, n. 2.

[320] Trans. Campbell, *Greek Lyric*, 1, p. 379.

falls asleep at the sound of Apollo's lyre at Pindar, *Pythian* 1. 10–12. The almost mystical association between walls and music is not hard to understand at a time when power, both symbolic and actual, not to mention mere survival were dependent upon the continuing efficacy of fortifications, whatever it took to build them, whether magic or beings of superhuman strength, whatever it took to keep them standing and, in the case of the enemy, bring them down. Thus, the walls of biblical Jericho are brought down by music (Josh. 6). Xenophon (*HG* 2. 2. 20–23) reports that, when the Spartans destroyed the long walls of Athens and the Piraeus fortifications in 404 BC, they carried it out to the accompaniment of flute music.

When and why certain ancient walls came to be associated with the race of semi-divine giants known as the Cyclopes is not clear, as we shall soon discover, but Euripides was fully aware of, and evidently intrigued by, the attribution, employing "Cyclopean" as a virtual epithet for ancient walls as well as the cities they encircle. This is not altogether to be expected of an Athenian: At Athens the Mycenaean circuit wall was attributed to the Pelasgians (the native, pre-Greek inhabitants of Attica) rather than the Cyclopes,[321] a story perhaps intended to conform to the much-cherished Athenian notion of autochthony. There is, on the other hand, a well-established tradition that the Cyclopes built the walls at Tiryns, Mycenae, and Argos; one might expect that, if a comparable myth of divine or semi-divine assistance existed at Athens, it too would have been preserved. Perhaps Athenians of the Classical period, who were both renowned and notorious for their "Baulust," were reticent to attribute architectural feats to anyone other than themselves. At any rate, this expertly constructed, massive wall, parts of which have always been visible, as evidenced by the fact they are taken into consideration by later architects on the site, was built all at once rather than in stages and served

---

[321] Hdt. 6. 137, who attributes the story to Hecataeus (*FrGrHist* 1 F 127); Paus. 1. 28. 3. Cf. Jeffrey M. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present* (Cambridge, Eng., 1999), p. 75, who illustrates (Fig. 53) a red-figure cup by the Penelope Painter from ca. 440 (Louvre G372), which has been taken to represent Athena directing a giant (so-labeled) carrying either a pile of stones or one large conglomerate stone destined for this wall; however, as Hurwit is careful to point out, there is no recorded tradition that giants built the walls at Athens. Robert D. Cromey, "History and Image: The Penelope Painter's Akropolis (Louvre G372 and 480/79 BC)," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101 (1991), 165–174, in a well-argued, yet not entirely convincing recent re-interpretation of the puzzling imagery of both sides of Louvre G372, concludes that the vase depicts an earlier historical occasion, the rebuilding of the Pandroseion in 479 after the destruction of the acropolis by the Persians.

as the principle means of defense of the Athenian acropolis for some 800 years.[322] During the Peloponnesian war, as Pericles' ambitious vision for the development of the acropolis continued to be pursued well after his death, attention would have been drawn anew to these colossal remains as more stretches of the ancient walls were exposed as a result of ongoing construction projects. There can be no doubt that Euripides would have had firsthand acquaintance with the physical demeanor of Cyclopean-style fortification walls, regardless whether he made an effort to view them in their native habitat, so to speak, the Argolid.

Just a few passages need be cited to affirm that the colossal-scaled masonry, both polygonal and ashlar, that is such a conspicuous feature of mainland Greek cities of the late Bronze age is a favorite architectural *topos* of Euripides. *Tr.* 1087–1088 has already been introduced. There, the chorus of Trojan captives contemplate a possible fate in "horse-grazing Argos, where they inhabit stony, Cyclopean walls reaching to the heavens" (ἱππόβοτον Ἄργος, ἵνα <τε> τείχη / λάϊνα Κυκλώπι' οὐράνια νέμονται). The ambiguity that has arisen regarding the grammatical voice of νέμονται may, in fact, be deliberate: Whether the verb is taken as middle (as I do in my translation), with an indefinite subject, or passive, that is to say, whether the walls are the direct object or the subject of the sentence makes little difference to the meaning; it is clear that the walls of Argos, as its most significant topographical feature, are to be read as a synecdoche for the Bronze age city itself, and that Argos' walls, still standing, are being invoked as a foil to the crumbling walls of Troy.[323] When, at *HF* 944, a messenger reports that a raging Heracles had threatened, in retribution against Eurystheus, to destroy the Κυκλώπων βάθρα ("Cyclopean foundations") of Mycenae, the detailed, technically-inspired description of how he will go about doing it that follows emphasizes that their physicality is primary, their symbolic demeanor, secondary, in Heracles' boast.[324] We know full well he is capable of such a feat, having twice

[322] Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, pp. 75–76, with fig. 54; for a complete list of preserved Cyclopean remains on the acropolis, see Loader, *Building in Cyclopean Masonry*, p. 29.

[323] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 251, prefers the middle, with an indefinite subject, i.e., "men inhabit." However, *pace* Lee, if I understand him correctly, there is no need to regard τείχη (or the alternate τείχεα, printed by Lee and others), if it is taken as the subject, as "standing for πόλεις" in any but a synecdochic sense.

[324] This aspect is also seized upon by Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 312, who, however, observes a more stringent terminological precision than I do: "The description at 945

destroyed Apollo's handiwork, the walls, at Troy (*Tr.* 799–829). A motley assortment of implements is itemized: μοχλούς (later, στρεπτῷ σιδήρῳ), δικέλλας, φοίνικι κανόνι, τύκοις ("iron crowbars, axes, the ruddled plumb-line, masons' hammers," vv. 944–946). Heracles means to employ whatever tools he can get his hands on fast in order to undo the stonework of the giants, but his ultimate weapon will be his divine strength, as suggested by his use of the verb συντριαινῶσαι ("to shatter with a trident"). Significantly, different implements are to be used to dismantle the walls than were used to raise them. On the earlier occasion, the stones were "carefully fitted" (ἡρμοσμένα) with masons' hammers (τύκοις) guided by a plumb line (φοίνικι κανόνι); now, however, cruder instruments, crowbars (μοχλούς) and axes (δικέλλας), more appropriate for deconstruction than for construction, will be applied to the carefully fashioned stones. While it took great skill and craftsmanship to raise the walls, brute strength and heavy iron will be sufficient to destroy them.

Treated with deference in *Heracles*, the tradition that towering, ancient walls composed of tightly packed, colossal stones were the work of a race of giants almost certainly inspires an ironical joke at *Cyc.* 115–118, a passage also mentioned earlier in the chapter. During a lengthy, stichomythic exchange between Odysseus and Silenus, the father of the satyrs, concerning the inhabitants of Mount Etna in Sicily, it is revealed that the Cyclopes did not, as it turns out, construct walls at all, but instead lived in caves, the work of nature, not of men. The significant part of the dialogue runs as follows:

> Od.: τείχη δὲ ποῦ 'στι καὶ πόλεως πυργώματα; ("But where are the walls and towers of the city?")
>
> Si.: οὐκ ἔστ'· ἔρημοι πρῶνες ἀνθρώπων, ξένε. ("There are none. The headlands are empty of humans, stranger.")

---

is appropriate to the ashlar masonry at Mycenae rather than to the main fortification," in deference to the distinctions articulated by Frazer on Paus. 2. 16. 5. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, p. 210, is dismissive of both the notion that the tragedians were interested in "eine reise zu topographisch-historischen studien" and the penchant of modern "dilettanten" to assume that they were, and that a poetic flourish such as this may indeed spring from a referent in the real world. For the sake of argument, however, he goes on to make the plausible suggestion that the frame of reference for E. in this passage is not actual Cyclopean remains, but rather the "unvergleichlich gearbeiteten marmormauern" of E.'s own day, when the standards for perfection were such as to require the use of the ruddled line.

Od.: τίνες δ' ἔχουσι γαῖαν; ἦ θηρῶν γένος; ("Who then occupy the land? Can it be a species of wild beast?")

Si.: Κύκλωπες, ἄντρ' ἔχοντες, οὐ στέγας δόμων. ("Cyclopes, who occupy caves, not roofed houses.")

A cluster of architectural terms—"walls," "city," "towers," "roofs," "houses"—is pitted against a cluster of "natural" terms—"headlands," "land," "species," "wild beasts," "caves"—with the effect of verbally reinforcing the differences between the civilized and the uncivilized in their habits of habitation.[325] Further questions confirm that these creatures are odd in a number of additional ways. They are not normal grain-eaters, but feast on protein; they do not know "the vine" and all of its attendant pleasures, and, worst of all, they eat humans! It appears, then, that in the rarified world of the satyr play, at least, humans have been mistaken in attributing such evident signs of civilization as expertly crafted walls to a race of man-eating beasts.[326] Possibly, Euripides is spoofing his own fondness for the term "Cylopean" as an epithet for walls and cities in drawing attention to the irony of the humorous encounter at Etna.

As these sample passages show, Euripides clearly fancied the notion of great, old walls as the handiwork of Cyclopean masons and made full use of its potential as an image. But where did he get it? A brief overview of the literary history of the term "Cyclopean" as an epithet for walls will prove instructive.[327] The term, somewhat surprisingly, is not Homeric. It appears in Pindar's fr. 169 a. 7 (Snell and Maehler) (Κυκλώπειον

[325] M.L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983), p. 214, observes a development during the fifth century of "a stronger historical awareness of technical progress," which resulted in changes in the conception of the lives and habits of primitive early beings such as the Giants, "who had earlier always been represented with human armour," being "reduced to fighting with boulders and tree-trunks," while Heracles "abandoned his hoplite panoply for simpler weapons." On the uncivilized ways of the Cyclopes, see Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City*, pp. 110–111.

[326] Homer's Cyclopes, too, are not builders; however, with the exception of Polyphemus, they apparently eat grains and know wine (*Od.* 109–111). Robert Mondi, "The Homeric Cyclopes: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113 (1983), 17–38, makes a case for detaching Polyphemus from the other Cyclopes; in his view, the idyllic, pastoral description of the Cyclopes' lifestyle that we get in *Od.* 106–115 represents the then current Greek tradition regarding these mythological figures, into which is inserted the Polyphemus story, a classic example, according to Mondi, of a widespread folkloric motif, the "escape from a blinded ogre" (op. cit., p. 17), which results in more than a few incongruities.

[327] Useful compendia of the ancient sources for the Cyclopes as builders may be found in S. Eitrem's article in *RE* 11^2, cols. 2329–2330, and Odette Touchefeu-Meynier's in *LIMC*, 6, pt. 1, s. v., pp. 154–155.

ἐπὶ πρόθυρον, "at the Cyclopean threshold," meaning Argos)[328] and Bacchylides 11. 77 (Snell and Maehler) (where the wall of Argos, built by the Cyclopes, is κάλλιστον, "most beautiful"). The Cyclopes are again associated with "great Argos" in the fragmentary lines 5–7 of Pindar's fr. 70a (Snell and Maehler); very likely some sort of architectural term or reference comparable to that of Bacchylides is missing. The epithet is found in a fragment of Sophocles' lost *Heracles* (fr. 227, *TrGF* 4), where an unusual expression, κυκλώπιον τροχόν ("cyclopean wheel"), is thought to refer to the circuit (that is, loosely speaking, the "circular") wall of Mycenae.[329] We learn from a scholion at Hesiod, *Theogony* 139 (*FGrH* 4 F 88) that Hellanicus claimed that a tribe of Cyclopes walled Mycenae.[330] Pausanias (2. 16. 5), in a passage already introduced, describes the circuit wall and Lions Gate at Mycenae as Κυκλώπων … ἔργα ("works of the Cyclopes"), who also "made the wall for Proetus in Tiryns," a claim that Apollodorus (2. 2. 1) also recounts.[331] At 2. 25. 8 Pausanias offers a fuller account of the Cyclopes' building the wall of Tiryns out of huge, unworked stones. The smaller stones that Pausanias believes served as a kind of mortar, some of which are still visible at Tiryns today, were apparently added later, although his use of πάλαι ("of old"), as of many adverbs in his account, is difficult to interpret in this context. It could indicate that the small stones were continuously replaced over time as they were loosened and fell from their positions. Even in its present

[328] The line is quoted by schol. Aristid. 52. 10 (Wilhelm Dindorf, *Aristides*, 3 [1829; repr. Hildesheim, 1964], p. 408), which further explains: τὸ γὰρ Κυκλωπείων ἐπὶ προθύρων [*sic*] σημαίνει τὸ Ἄργος, ἐπειδήπερ οἱ Κύκλωπες ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐτείχισαν τὸ Ἄργος.

[329] A.C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles, Edited with Additional Notes from the Papers of Sir R.C. Jebb and Dr W.G. Headlam*, 1 (Cambridge, Eng., 1917), pp. 169–170; "τροχός· τεῖχος, mit dem Namen spielend," according to Eitrem (*RE* 11², col. 2329), less convincingly. More likely it is a play on the name, "Cyclops," itself, which in antiquity was believed to be derived from the word for "circle," in reference to the pupil of the trademark single eye (*RE* 11², col. 2328), an etymology first proposed by Hesiod (*Th.* 143–145) which Mondi, "The Homeric Cyclopes," p. 37, discredits.

[330] A scholion at Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1091 (*FGrH* 3 F 12) relates the circumstances of their arrival in the Argolid, on the occasion for which, see Charles Dugas, "Observations sur la légende de Persée," *Revue des Études Grecques* 69 (1956), 1–15 (7–9), who suggests that the Cyclopes are thereby introduced into the Perseus story in order that Perseus as king may be associated with the oversight of the building of the massive fortifications there.

[331] Cf. Paus. 7. 25. 6; Hsch., s. vv. Κυκλώπων ἕδος (K 4463–4491 Latte), Τιρύνθιον πλίνθε(υ)μα (T 940 Schmidt), likewise attributes the fortifications at Mycenae and Tiryns to the Cyclopes. Eust. 286. 20–21 (Van der Valk) observes that: Τὴν δὲ Τίρυνθα τειχιόεσσαν λέγει διὰ τὸ εὖ τετειχίσθαι, a feat which he then attributes to the Argive band of Cyclopes (on which see further below) and, somewhat later, Proetus, too, following the ancient sources.

state of preservation, as illustrations show, the Cyclopean masonry of the citadel of Tiryns matches well Pausanias' description.[332] There remain great crevices between the stones in which only a few of the small filler-stones are preserved; the walls, obviously, stand without them, suggesting that they were a later addition. In another attribution Strabo (8. 6. 2 and 11) mentions "caves with labyrinths" near Nauplia which are called "Cyclopean" and that they may have been named after the same tribe of Cyclopes who helped Proetus wall Tiryns.[333] All in all, the foregoing compendium of sources is rather sparser than one might expect, with the technical logistics of Cyclopean masonry generally of more interest to prose writers than the image is to poets. On that account alone it is noteworthy that the term turns up as frequently as it does in Euripides.

An explanation for Euripides' attachment to the epithet may lie in the testimonia about the Cyclopes' legendary association not only with building walls but with other forms of craftsmanship, a contingency which might have appealed to the reputed craftsman in Euripides. Hellanicus (*FGrH* 4 F 88) distinguishes three types (γένη) of Cyclopes: (1) the ones who walled Mycenae; (2) the ones who gathered around Polyphemus; and (3) the ones who were divinities (αὐτοὶ οἱ θεοί). The three tribes of Cyclopes are distinguished somewhat differently by the scholiast at Aristides 52. 10 (Dindorf); there, they are (1) the Σικελοί, being the ones in the *Odyssey*; (2) the χειρογάστορες, a colorful epithet that is further explained as "those who live by their hands," in reference to the group who walled Argos; and, finally, (3) the ones who are called οὐράνιοι.[334] The putative expertise of the middle group would explain why Bacchylides (11. 77) calls the wall of Argos "most beautiful." Strabo (8. 6. 11) also applies a version of the epithet, this time, spelled γαστερόχειρας, to the seven Cyclopes who assisted Proetus in fortifying Tiryns, but explains more literally that the name was given to them because they were "nourished from their craft" (τρεφομένους ἐκ τῆς τέχνης).[335] Scholia at

---

[332] S. Marinatos and M. Hirmer, *Crete and Mycenae* (New York, [n. d.]), pls. 152–155.

[333] Cf. Eust. 286 (Van der Valk) and 1621 (Stallbaum), following Strabo's account.

[334] Cf. Jacoby in *FGrH* Ia [Kommentar], pp. 458–459, who suspects that the second account is based on that of Hellanicus. Th. 6. 2. 1 lists the Cyclopes and the Laestrygonians as the earliest inhabitants of Sicily.

[335] Text: Horace L. Jones, *The Geography of Strabo*, 4 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1927); cf. Eust. 1621 (Stallbaum) and 286 (Van der Valk), where a far more marvelous etymology, that their hands grow out of their stomachs, is attributed to "myth" as opposed to "history"; Eitrem (*RE* 11^2, col. 2343) suspects, in this case, an underlying phallic association with the hands that is common to the fire daemons and mythical technicians of numerous cultures. That the epithet may be more than a little derogatory is suggested

Euripides' *Orestes* 965, discussing the Cyclopes in an attempt to elucidate the Euripidean expression γᾶ Κυκλωπία, claim that "they were the best technicians" (ἦσαν δὲ ἄριστοι τεχνῖται), that they walled various cities in the Argolid, and that the ones who were ἐγχειρογάστορες were responsible for the circuit wall (περιετείχισαν) at Mycenae.

The Cyclopes are credited with "inventing" towers (turres), as distinct from walls (muros), by Aristotle, according to Pliny (*NH* 7. 195),[336] where the invention of "working in iron" (fabricam ferrariam) is also attributed to them (*NH* 7. 198); indeed, legendary metalworking skills are ascribed to both the Sicilian and the "heavenly" Cyclopean tribes.[337] In Hesiod's *Theogony* 139–146, the Cyclopes, of which there are three, "fashioned" (τεῦξαν, v. 141 [West]) Zeus' thunder-and-lightning bolt (cf. schol. E. *Or.* 965), an event which took place before the birth of Hephaistos, who presumably would have done it had he been around. Apollodorus (1. 2. 1) later adds that, besides the thunder, lightning, and bolt for Zeus, the Cyclopes also supplied Pluto with a helmet of invisibility and Poseidon with a trident, weapons which were used by the gods in their battle with the Titans. Callimachus (3. 46–79) depicts them as huge, terrifying monsters "at the anvils of Hephaistos" at work on an iron horse-trough for Poseidon. While Aeschylus (*Pr.* 366–369) has Hephaistos working ore at the summit (κορυφαῖς) of Mt. Etna (perhaps a convenient *aition* to explain its volcanic condition), the metalworking Sicilian branch of Cyclopes eventually join Hephaistos in his workshop *under* Etna, a tradition of which Euripides is apparently aware in his

---

by Athenaeus 1. 4 d, where τὸν βίον … εὐσταθεῖς ("the well-situated") are contrasted with ἐγχειρογάστορες ("those who need to do manual labor to feed themselves"); cf. γλωττογαστόρων ("those who thrive by their tongues"), a coinage of Aristophanes' at *Av.* 1695–1705 serving as the lynchpin of a satirical joke at the Athenians' expense that is apparently aimed at an audience well aware of the epithet's association with the Cyclopes and ready to make a connection with the lawless tribe of *Od.* 9 (Dunbar, *Aristophanes Birds*, p. 741).

336 Text: H. Rackham, *Pliny. Natural History*, 2 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1942). The verb is ellipsed, but may be inferred from "invenit" earlier in Pliny's catalog. Pliny adds that Theophrastus, on the contrary, credits the invention of towers to the Tirynthians, but Valentinus Rose, *Aristotelis qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta* (1886; repr. Stuttgart, 1967), p. 305 (ad loc. fr. 479), suggests that the equivalent of διὰ Κυκλώπων, as at Strabo 8. 6. 11, should be supplied. The invention of walls is credited to Thrason.

337 Cf. Hsch., s. v. Κυκλώπων· χαλκέων (K 4463–4491 Latte). For a comprehensive account of the rich tradition of sources on the metalworking skills of the Cyclopes, see Eitrem in *RE* 11^2, cols. 2331 and 2340–2343.

Cyclops, and it is there that they may have had a hand in forging the shields of Achilles and, later, of Aeneas.[338]

Hesiod (*Th.* 139–146) characterizes the Cyclopes as "having a tempestuous spirit" (ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας, v. 139 [West]; cf. Homer's ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων at *Od.* 9. 106) and being "like the gods" except for the fact that they have a single eye in the middle of their foreheads (cf. Apollod. 1. 1. 2; E. *Cyc.* 21, 79; Call. 3. 52–54);[339] their strength, power and skills are said to reside ἐπ' ἔργοις ("in their works"). Apollo, in vv. 5–6 of the prologue of *Alcestis*, calls the Cyclopes, whom he has slain, τέκτονας Δίου πυρός ("fashioners of the fire of Zeus"). Pindar, fr. 266 (Snell and Maehler) has Zeus slaying them in order that they may not furnish weapons for someone else. The Orphic Theogonies go further, attributing to the heavenly Cyclopes authorship of the σχήματα ("forms") of the entire universe, and calling them teachers of all the handworking skills presided over by Hephaistos and Athena.[340] By the time of Virgil, the legend of their skills is so well-established that the poet can claim, without further elaboration, that the very walls of Elysium have been "brought

[338] Regarding the last, I follow Christine Walde in *NP* 6, col. 962, who seems to assume that they helped with the shields, since they dwelt with Hephaistos; while I was unable to find an explicit reference to this activity in the sole ancient source that she cites, Orph. fr. 179 (see below), or any other ancient source on the Cyclopes, it remains a possibility. Callimachus (3. 46–85) is the first to place "explizit" the Cyclopes in the workshop of Hephaistos; however, at *Cyc.* 297–298, E. has the Cyclops dwelling ὑπ' Αἴτνῃ without mention of Hephaistos, yet at 599, Hephaistos is invoked as ἄναξ Αἰτναῖε. Virgil (*Georg.* 4. 170–175), by his own admission, risking a comparison of "parva" with "magnis" (176), applies to the worker bees a simile of the Cyclopes forging thunderbolts while Etna groans with the anvils' efforts. For a full account of the sources for the Cyclopes' inhabitation of Etna, see Eitrem in *RE* 11², col. 2331. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 1, pp. 150–151, attributes the apparent inappropriateness of σκόπελοι (*HF* 639) used of Mt. Etna to the fact that E. had never seen a volcano, nor had ever been to Sicily.

[339] For a full list of the ancient sources on the single eye, with comparanda from the mythological traditions of other cultures, ancient and modern, see Eitrem in *RE* 11², cols. 2343–2345. Mondi, "The Homeric Cyclopes," pp. 31–38, addressing the much debated question of the absence of an explicit reference in *Od.* 9 to Polyphemus as being one-eyed, attempts to refute the notion of a widespread tradition that the Cyclopes were one-eyed. On the not very plausible theory, once mistakenly attributed to Empedocles, that fossilized bones of dwarf, cave-dwelling, Mediterranean elephants might have inspired stories of a race of single-eyed, man-eating, cave-dwelling giants, the Cyclopes, see Adrienne Mayor, *The First Fossil Hunters. Paleontology in Greek and Roman Times* (Princeton, 2000), pp. 6–8 and 35–36, with fig. 1. 9. For a consideration of the possible Indo-European roots of the name Κύκλωψ in reference to the disc of the sun and other potential etymologies, see Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache*, §§ 326–330.

[340] Frgs. 178–180 (Otto Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* [1922, repr. Berlin, 1963]); on the difficulties of assigning dates to this material, see West, *The Orphic Poems*, pp. 1–3.

out of the furnaces of the Cyclopes" (Cyclopum educta caminis / moenia, *Aen.* 6. 630–631). Curiously, though, in spite of their expertise in many handicrafts, they are unable to build ships in the *Odyssey* (9. 125–130).[341]

Mythological traditions like these, along with the verifiably gargantuan size and height of the physical remains at Bronze age sites and a collective memory of their ubiquity, would account for the legend of the Cyclopes' building prowess which obtained during Euripides' day. In Euripides the epithet "Cyclopean" is used to emphasize the imposing physical presence of masonry walls and the degree of wonder that seeing or hearing about them engenders. Actual Cyclopean walls were visible at the acropolis of Athens, as noted above. The colossal relief decorating the relieving triangle over the lintel block of the Lions Gate at Mycenae has apparently always been at least partially visible above ground.[342] Diodorus Siculus (11. 65. 5) records the destruction of Mycenae by the neighboring Argives in the 460s (τὰς Μυκήνας κατέσκαψαν)[343] and observes that this ancient city of "great men" and "remarkable [ἀξιολόγους, perhaps a euphemism] deeds" remained uninhabited (διέμεινεν ἀοίκητος) into his own time. The famous gate was, however, still visible in Pausanias' day, when the periegete was able to describe the following, among the sights at Mycenae (2. 16. 5–6): λείπεται δὲ ὅμως ἔτι καὶ ἄλλα τοῦ περιβόλου καὶ ἡ πύλη, λέοντες δὲ ἐφεστήκασιν αὐτῇ· Κυκλώπων δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἔργα εἶναι λέγουσιν ("Nevertheless there still remain other parts of the circuit wall and the gate, upon which lions have been placed. And these things also are said to be the work of the Cyclopes"). But even if Euripides never actually saw this most majestic monument to the heroic past, the sheer quantity of architectural references and illusions in his plays, whether or not their actual existence can be documented in each instance, substantiates the conclusion that archaeological plausibility, if not unequivocal accuracy, was a real concern for him. The large number of references to Cyclopean masonry in Euripides indicates at the very least that the playwright acknowledged the trope as a distinctive

---

[341] Mondi, "The Homeric Cyclopes," p. 26, sees this as one of many features that are meant to contrast the Cyclopes with the cultivated, seafaring Phaeacians.

[342] Higgins, *Minoan and Mycenaean Art*, p. 8; Stephen C. Law in Nancy Thomson de Grummond, ed., *An Encyclopedia of the History of Classical Archaeology* (Westport, CT, 1996), p. 684, observes only that, in the ca. 1, 600 years between the descriptions of the gate by Pausanias in the second century and Clarke, Dodwell, and Gell in the early years of the nineteenth, "the existence of the gate was not recorded."

[343] For the date, see W.G. Forrest, "Themistocles and Argos," *Classical Quarterly* 10 (1960), 221–241 (230–232).

sign of Bronze age habitation, that he was aware of the manifold legends surrounding their existence, and that he was concerned about archaeological authenticity in this matter. We are left to concede either that Euripides' usage reflects common parlance of his day, perhaps owing to a direct re-acquaintance with the intimidating monumentality of Bronze age remains as city walls were being refurbished or constructed anew during the Peloponnesian war, or—even more intriguing—that he himself was the popularizer of this picturesque image. Given Euripides' fascination with the language of craft, and the paucity of occurrences of the term among his contemporaries, the latter seems preferable.

πυργόω

To return finally to the leading motif of the chapter, the Troy of *Trojan Women*: At *Tr.* 1087–1088 we may suspect that "Cyclopean" as an epithet for the walls of Argos catches in the throats of the chorus of Trojan women and is voiced almost with a reverential hush; the walls of their own city, after all, are no more. Destruction, of course, is at the forefront of this play. Yet, with destruction so palpably in evidence, its unavoidable inverse, *construction*, cannot help but be implied, though the raising of their city is but a retreating memory for the surviving captives. If so, the multiple occurrences in *Trojan Women* of the architecturally inflected verb, πυργόω—a favorite of Euripides, occurring some twelve times, with most examples clustered in this play—are understandable.[344] In addition cognates and synonyms of πυργόω are also frequent in Euripides. In most instances this language assumes the form of epithets for cities and as such its function is conceptual rather than archaeological or topographical. In short we need not on every occasion envision literal "towers;" πυργόω and its cognates in Euripides are often applied to the *idea* of a city and what makes a city a civilized place for humans to dwell, which would include walls and towers. In that sense these usages are at least partly metaphorical. Some examples: Greece is alluded to as the "high-towered fatherland" (ὑψίπυργον πατρίδ') at *Tr.* 376. The

[344] Paley[2] 2, p. 421, in reference to *Ba.* 19, wisely describes πύργοι as "fortified walls," which would, of course, include towers. This notion that both walls and towers = fortification is implicit in the πυργόω metaphor, though I do not always include both in my translations. Pauer, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*, p. 159, also notes the dearth of the term in other poets in comparison with E.'s multiple uses. Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 546–549, provides a brief overview of E.'s use of the metaphor.

cities of Asia Minor are "beautifully-towered" (καλλιπυργώτους) at *Ba.* 19, an epithet which, according to E.R. Dodds, constitutes a neologism for καλλιπύργους.[345] The wall of Thebes is called a "seven-mouthed fortification wall" (ἑπτάστομον πύργωμα) at *Ph.* 287 and *Supp.* 1221. Troy is a "well-walled" (εὐτειχῆ) hill at *Andr.* 1010; its πυργώματα are mentioned by Helen at *Hel.* 51. The πυργώματα at *Tr.* 1174 and *Cyc.* 115 have already been discussed.

The source of inspiration for these multiple images? Contrary to what might be expected, πυργόω is not especially Homeric; its sole occurrence at *Od.* 11. 264 is not metaphorical. The verb's only appearance in Aeschylus is in *Persians* (v. 192), where it has metaphorical sense, this, despite Aeschylus' having had πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνά applied to him at Ar. *Ra.* 1004, as Bond has noted.[346] It does not occur in Sophocles. Thus, the metaphorical use of πυργόω can be said to be something of an innovation in the hands of Euripides. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's explanation of its appearance at *HF* 475, where Megara tells her sons that, had circumstances been otherwise, their proud father would have "raised them like towers" (ἐπύργου),[347] helps to account for the metaphor's prevalence in Euripides: "πυργοῦν in metaphorischem sinne ist ein wort, das dem baulustigen 5. jahrhundert so gut wie ausschliefslich angehört" ("π. in metaphorical sense is a word that belongs virtually exclusively to the fifth century with its lust for building.")[348] But it does not account for its absence in Sophocles, who was also an eyewitness to the "baulustigen 5. Jahrhundert," which leads us back once more to the premise of this study, that Euripides was more interested in such imagery than his contemporaries.

As Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and others have observed, there is undoubtedly an element of pomposity, boastfulness, or exaggeration beyond the requirements of the occasion behind the metaphor.[349] Achilles

---

345 Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 65.

346 Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 125–126; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 182, discussing *Tr.* 612, suggests that Aristophanes is in fact parodying E.'s use of the term since he has Dionysus address Aeschylus "in Euripides' hearing." At *Eum.* 688 ἀντεπύργωσαν is literal; but ἐλπίδων ὑψιπύργων at A. *Supp.* 96–97, and perhaps the semi-metaphorical πυργηρέομαι ("besieged, beleaguered") at *Th.* 22, 184, should be noted. E. has the latter as well at *Or.* 762, 1574; *Ph.* 1087.

347 Although Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 146, in her commentary, translates πυργόω, most effectively, "to build tower-high," she renders it with the prosaic "set up strongly" in her translation (p. 57).

348 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 117.

349 Ibid.

is "towered up with courage" at *Rh.* 122, as is Menelaus at *Or.* 1568.[350] The former is not necessarily an exaggeration, as it is said of Achilles, although the use of the metaphor is thought provoking; the latter provides a sure means of characterizing Menelaus' pomposity.[351] At *HF* 238 Lycus uses πεπύργωσαι to characterize in a demeaning way a long-winded speech by Heracles' father, Amphitryon. As for himself, on the other hand, Lycus claims that he will answer with actions, not words, although his own words are destined to remain an idle boast, as he fails to carry out his threat to set the altar and its suppliants on fire.

At *Supp.* 998 Evadne bemoans the day when her city, Argos, "towered-up" (ἐπύργωσε) its good wishes in wedding songs for Evadne and her bridegroom, Capaneus, who is now dead.[352] The force behind the metaphor appears to be the cruel vanity of that earlier celebration, not the insincerity of its celebrants. It may be significant that Evadne has climbed along a path to the peak of a rocky hill (αἰθερίαν … πέτραν) that "towers over" (ὑπερακρίζει, v. 988) the temple precinct, in which her husband's body lies on his funeral pyre. There she delivers her monody before committing suicide by flinging herself from the rock and onto the pyre. As well, Capaneus had been killed by a bolt of lightning as he was attempting to scale the gates of Thebes with a ladder (*Supp.* 496–498 and 860). It is possible that all of this has put Evadne in mind of towers. Jason uses this same metaphor at *Med.* 526 to imply that Medea's claim of saving his life has been overstated: ἐπειδὴ καὶ λίαν πυργοῖς χάριν. The metaphor is used to refer to the speaking habits of heralds in general, and of the herald of Eurystheus, in particular, at *Heracl.* 293: δὶς τόσα πυργοῦν τῶν γιγνομένων. Paley and others have detected a pattern in Euripides' plays that implies a disdain for heralds.[353] Teiresias credits

---

[350] Some mss. of *Rh.* have χερί, others, θράσει, which W.H. Porter, *The Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge, Eng., 1929), p. 51, suggests was mistaken by analogy with *Or.* 1568.

[351] Halleran, *Stagecraft in Euripides*, p. 43, points to the proximity of κλῄθρων at *Or.* 1567 and suggests that perhaps πεπύργωσαι here "should be taken paronomastically."

[352] Of Evadne's lines here, Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 360, cautions: "The text of the monody is as seriously corrupt as any passage in the extant plays." Collard, op. cit., pp. 364–365, outlines the problems associated with ms. L's version of vv. 995–999; he does not, however, comment on the use of πυργόω. Despite the problems the sense of the metaphor is clear and remains essentially unaffected by the emendations which have been proposed.

[353] Paley^2 1, pp. l–li, citing this passage, along with fr. 1030 (= 1012), *Or.* 895–897 (which Diggle brackets), *Supp.* 381–382 (add 426), *Tr.* 423–425: "He evinces a great dislike of heralds, as the conceited and overbearing ministers of tyrants. It is probable that he regarded their arrogance and self-interest as one of the causes of foolish wars. Every where he represents them in an odious light, and especially he ridicules their loquacity

Cadmus with having built the towers of Thebes (ὅς … ἐπύργωσ' ἄστυ Θηβαίων τόδε) at *Ba.* 172, a claim that appears subtly sarcastic and even humorous when Cadmus himself then emerges, a pathetic old man in Dionysiac dress (σκευήν, v. 180), ready to "shake his hoary head" (v. 185) in an orgiastic dance.[354]

It is clear from the above that, for a person to "tower [him- or herself] up" is to puff oneself up with self-regard, a timeless recipe for imminent reversal of fortune. The same may be said for a city, with singular relevance to a city like Troy, renowned for its fortifications. However, something more profoundly tragic is at stake in our next example. Both the ephemeral (as it turns out) strength of Troy's walls as well as the presumptuous (again, as things turns out) high hopes of Trojans are called to mind by the term's use in the beautiful "Ganymede Ode" at *Tr.* 843–844. The choral lines are addressed to Eros, the god responsible for causing Zeus to fall in love with Ganymede, a Trojan prince, and to conduct him to Olympus to serve all of the gods: ὡς τότε μὲν μεγάλως Τροίαν ἐπύργωσας ("How impressively you towered up Troy at the time"), only

---

and presumption in arguing with their superiors;" cf. Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 209, who speaks of "E.'s apparent antipathy to heralds as a genus." The attitude seems not necessarily to be confined to E. At S. *Tr.* 616 Deianeira appears to be aware of the habit of some members of the profession to reconfigure the facts toward their own ends when she demands of the messenger Lichas that he φύλασσε … νόμον; Malcolm Davies, *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991), p. 166, calls the passage a "warning against officiousness in a messenger." Critics, however, are far from united on this issue. Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 230, ad loc. E. *Or.* 895–897, noting a "widespread Greek prejudice against 'spokesmen' as having forfeited the respect due to those who speak their own mind," cautions, however, that "Greek sentiment about heralds was in fact mixed." It is in fact a rare occasion when a messenger is greeted with skepticism upon announcing his news, as at E. *El.* 765, according to George Gellie, "Tragedy and Euripides' *Electra*," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 28 (1981), 1–12 (4, with references in n. 7): "In the three tragedians there are 26 messengers and heralds who enter a play to give extended information. This is the only one who is not trusted on sight."

[354] On the vexed question of whether or not the outfit associated with Dionysos, and which we should imagine on Cadmus in this scene, should be considered effeminate, Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, pp. 39–40, discussing the god's appearance in Ar. *Ra.*, is noncommittal, expressing a commonly held view that the yellow dress, traditionally worn by women, "is also a long-standing attribute of Dionysos, an aspect of his association with festivity." However, in a recent study, Thomas H. Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens* (Oxford, 1997), p. 107, argues that, contra Dover and others, the "krokotos" (yellow dress) and kothornoi (high boots) are *not* regular attributes of Dionysos on vases; rather: "That the krokotos is explicitly female dress is made clear by many other passages in Aristophanes' surviving plays," and: "Kothornoi, too, are associated with women there, but can be worn by men as well"; examples are given in ns. 15–16.

to let her down later. Biehl translates "gewaltig aufgetürmt (= Trojas Geltung erhöht)," makes no mention of the walls of Troy, and observes that the term's usage here preserves scarcely anything of even its metaphorical sense of "Hochmut."[355] Meanwhile Tyrrell maintains that the use of πυϱγόω in the passage is solely metaphorical: "There is no allusion to the building of the walls of Troy"; Lee seems by his translation ("exalted") to concur.[356] I would argue otherwise. In the earlier edition of her book, *The Imagery of Euripides*,[357] Barlow tempered Tyrrell's dismissive claim even as she deferred to it; yet by suggesting that the lines refer to the "physical construction of the city but also to the favour shown in general by the Gods to Troy" and noting that: "Twice [this passage and *Tr.* 612–613, discussed below] the word πυϱγόω is used in abstract context as if the physical building of the city is important to other things too," Barlow clearly saw that the term is meant in at least two ways, and that the physical allusion must not be brushed aside.[358] The Trojans had with some reason expected preferential treatment from Zeus because of Ganymede's high station, but did not receive it. Eros, by having gods consort with mortal Trojans like Ganymede and Tithonus, is being blamed for puffing up, figuratively speaking, the Trojans' trust in the actual strength of their walls and thereby subscribing to the idea, now visibly evident to have been hubristic, of the invincibility of their city. The chorus sing this passage as the walls and towers that epitomize Troy's strength lie at least partially in ruins—this, in spite of the fact that they were built by gods (Poseidon, it will be remembered, had specified in the prologue that he and Apollo built the walls); therein lies the cynicism. The chorus of *Andr.* 1009–1010 also expresses its disappointment in the two gods who built the walls of Troy. For it seems a paradox to them that, after having "towered up" (πυϱγόω, again) the hill of Troy, Apollo and Poseidon proceeded to doom their own handiwork (ὄϱγανον χεϱοτεκτοσύνας, *Andr.* 1014–1015).[359]

[355] Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 316.

[356] Tyrrell, *The Troades of Euripides*, p. 95; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 218.

[357] Shirley A. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides* (London, 1971), pp. 117 and 159, n. 94.

[358] It may be significant that Barlow removed her approving reference to Tyrrell in the 2nd ed. of her book (*The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 159, n. 94); she has nothing to say of it in her commentary, *Euripides Trojan Women*.

[359] Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 153, calls this "the ingenious and convincing emendation by C. Carey ... of the unintelligible MS reading ὀϱγάναν χέϱα τεκτοσύνας." Carey, "Euripides, Andromache 1014–15," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 23 (1977), 16, observes: "The noun χεϱοτεκτοσύνη does not occur elsewhere, but could easily have been created by Euripides as a poetic, and metrically convenient, substitute for the prose χειϱοτεχνία."

Hecuba had questioned the motives of the gods at *Tr.* 612–613 in an enigmatic gnomic statement that has received varied interpretations: ὁρῶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν, ὡς τὰ μὲν πυργοῦσ' ἄνω / τὰ μηδὲν ὄντα, τὰ δὲ δοκοῦντ' ἀπώλεσαν.[360] Translate (loosely): "I see the handiwork of the gods, how the same things they tower up from nothing they destroy when they give the appearance of [too much] power." Both Trojans and Greeks are implicated in this indictment of the handiwork of the gods. As ever, taking the long view, Hecuba must be referring to the rise and fall of Troy, while at the same time hinting at the vulnerability to the same process of the victorious Greeks. If David Kovacs is correct in his interpretation of *Tr.* 95–97, then Poseidon had issued a warning earlier in the play that "whoever of mortals sacks cities is foolish ..." if the victor subsequently fails to avoid victimization himself.[361] But there can be no mistaking that at vv. 612–613 it is the walls, themselves, which are the referent, the visible emblem of the "apparent" (τὰ δοκοῦντ') power of the Trojans, and that the "seeming" to be powerful, the direct result of the walls' visibility to outsiders, is as much the handiwork of the gods as is the masonry.[362] Again πυργόω is the term of choice for a cynical way to characterize the gods' habit of building up only in order to destroy a person's or a people's expectations of power and notions of invincibility which they themselves had encouraged, not the least of which were symbolized by the gods' having built actual walls for the Trojan people which amounted in the end to nothing at all (= τὰ μὲν πυργοῦσ' ἄνω / τὰ μηδὲν ὄντα), since the immortals did not prevent what is happening now. The walls were nothing before they were something. And, as a reminder that appearances may be deceptive, when they were something, they

360 I concur with Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 182, that there is no need for Elmsley's emendation τὸ μηδὲν, which is followed by Diggle; thus, I print Lee's text here. For slightly different interpretations, Lee, loc. cit.; Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 117, and *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 189.

361 David Kovacs, "Euripides, *Troades* 95–7: Is Sacking Cities Really Foolish?," *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983), 334–338 (336): "What Poseidon means is not that the sacking of cities itself falls under divine condemnation and is therefore foolish. Rather, that man is a fool who, after conspicuous success, meets by his own subsequent action with conspicuous failure. A man who has caused a city's shrines and tombs to be untended by killing or enslaving its population is a successful man, but if he later suffers the same fate he has brought upon others, his later failure is thrown into sharper relief by his earlier success, and his folly and ignominy are increased."

362 Once again, in an otherwise excellent analysis, Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 259, overlooks entirely the significance of the physical walls in the particular context of this play.

were not what they seemed, and Troy fell. On the other hand, those for whom the gods did not grant the favor of building walls, the Greeks (as far as the Trojans knew), that is, those seeming to be powerful for the present moment, will themselves be brought to grief by the very gods who temporarily exalted them at the expense of the Trojans. In this interpretation τὰ ὄντα refers to actual reality, and thus, ironically, refers to nothingness, which is Troy's present state, literally and symbolically, while τὰ δοκοῦντ' refers to illusory reality (that is, the Greeks' present state) which itself will become nothing when the Greeks receive their inevitable due. It may be significant that πυργοῦσι is in the present tense, with progressive/repeated aspect, as if it may apply to anyone at any time for an indefinite amount of time, while ἀπώλεσαν is a gnomic aorist, as if destruction was once and for all time. In a comparable vein is the cynicism of Euripides' so-called "atheistic" fr. 286. 15 (*Bell.*): τά θεῖα πυργοῦσ' αἵ κακαί τε συμφοραί ("[something] and misfortunes tower up the workings of the gods," in other words, the business of the gods depends upon human misfortune, and it is in their interest to keep things such). The context is apparently a lengthy, bitter invective against the notion of honoring the gods and receiving just rewards accordingly: One should lead to the other but often does not, yet this does not deter mortals from turning to religion to get through life.[363] In *Trojan Women* there is evidence enough for this greatest of the many ironies of mortal existence, one that for certain has not been sorted out to the present day.

Conclusion

In Euripides' *Trojan Women* the very city of Troy has offered itself up, through the words and gestures of its actors, as a picture of ruins, a witness as eloquent as any to the ephemeral nature of life and the futility of piety, a terrible *vanitas* whose reach is to be far greater than the fled one

[363] The line is fragmentary and defective and may not even belong to this play. Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 115, puts v. 15 with the major fragment to which it "has become attached in the anthological tradition;" he warns, however, that it may not even belong to *Bell.* Christoph Riedweg, "The 'Atheistic' Fragment from Euripides' *Bellerophontes* (286 N^2)," *Illinois Classical Studies* 15 (1990), 39–53, discusses the fragment in relation to Euripides' views about religion and argues persuasively for the retention of line 15; he believes that the lacuna after 14 consisted of three or more lines (p. 46) and that it "must have supplied further evidence for the non-existence of the gods" (p. 43). He translates line 15: "X and misfortunes build up religion like a tower" (p. 45).

of the city's earlier glory. The sacred spaces of the city, already deserted at the beginning of the play (*Tr.* 15), are soon to be joined in desolation by the remainder of the cityscape as if cued by the final words of the resigned chorus of Trojan captives. At least they have futures; the city has none. It is not hard to be convinced in this pessimistic play that Hecuba means it when she says that song will not be enough to preserve the memory of a lost, great civilization, that Troy's end is, in fact, final, as Poole has argued, in defiance of most interpretations of what Hecuba intends with such sentiments.[364] In fr. 11 (West^2) of Simonides' elegy on the battle of Plataea, it is *pre*-sacked Troy that was "famous in song" (τοὶ δὲ πόλι]ν πέρσαντες ἀοίδιμον, v. 13), and it is the victorious Greeks whose names are, in West's translation, "bathed in fame that cannot die" (οἷσιν ἐπ' ἀθά]ṇατον κέχυται κλέος ἀṇ[δρός], v. 15).[365] Troy is not the only ancient city whose mighty reputation threatened to be diminished by posterity's intrinsic aptitude for forgetfulness. Thucydides (1. 10), worrying about the long-term standing of Sparta as compared to Athens, warns those of the future against judging the importance of a city by its archaeological remains—a backhanded way to admit that, inevitably, the greatness of a city will in fact be judged by the reputation of its built structures, at least by those who do not know Thucydides' history, which attempts to set the record straight. For he means to elevate Sparta to equal status with Athens, which is not only admirable but almost certainly accurate, yet historical perception from at least the time of Plutarch onward has had it otherwise, and the long-celebrated glory of Athens' built environment, confirmed by archaeological investigation, has prevailed in popular estimation.[366] Furthermore, at the same time as the destruction of Troy was staged in 415 BC in *Trojan Women* with exceptional vividness, the lavishly appointed Athenian acropolis in all its gleaming newness must have seemed especially vulnerable to the members of the play's first audience, sitting with their backs to a real-life spectacle of flaunted affluence, power, and prosperity in the middle of a real-life war whose full consequences were yet to be determined.[367]

---

364 Poole, "Total Disaster," pp. 283–285.

365 M.L. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1993), p. 169.

366 A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 1 (Oxford, 1945), p. 113, notes that "Plutarch, *Per.* 12, does just what Thucydides says later generations will do, judge of Athens' power and wealth by the buildings that remain."

367 Cf. Anderson, *The Fall of Troy*, p. 166, n. 13: "To an Athenian audience, which could look back to see their own acropolis opposite the flames and smoke engulfing Troy, the drama must have presented a frightening image of war's perilous consequences."

Pindar has taught us that architecture "sings." At *Pythian* 6. 7–18 (Snell and Maehler) the façade of a treasure-house of song (ὕμνων θησαυρός, vv. 7–8) will proclaim (ἀπαγγελεῖ, v. 18) a victory, appropriately enough, at Delphi, where the jewel-box like buildings proliferated, and at *Olympian* 6. 1–4 crafting an effective victory song is tantamount to constructing a golden-columned portico that will "shine afar," as, for example, does the spectacularly cited temple of Poseidon at Sounion still. To reconstruct images of Athens, Corinth, Delphi, and many other great ancient cities in their glory days is a relatively simple exercise in the use of one's imagination, owing to the continuing preservation of numerous surviving monuments, even in fragmentary states. There is no architecture from Troy (or Sparta) to inspire such images. Homer's and Euripides' Troy exists today as a stratification level. A fitting postscript to Euripides' *Trojan Women*, a play full of reminders of the ironic vicissitudes of life and legacy, the ultimate irony may lie in how elusive a task it has been for modern archaeologists to identify the remains of the walls of Homeric Troy. In spite of this reality check, and while, if I may paraphrase Hardy,[368] the President of the Immortals has long ended his sport with this most renowned of ancient cities and its inhabitants, the name of the city lives on, and the walls of εὐτείχεος Τροία have assumed the mantel of immortality bestowed on the legendary. Yet, while it is true that the name of the city has survived, it has survived as a kind of synonym not for wealth, luxury, and success but rather for hubris, destruction, and, ultimately, deep, impenetrable, sadness that has moved audiences for centuries. Like Dresden after the Allied bombing in the last year of World War II, and the World Trade Center in New York in the days after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Troy, fictional or historical, has found a place in the collective consciousness that is impossible to dislodge, not, as its leading citizens might have wished, at the peak of its brilliance, but rather in its destroyed state. Once ruination has been glimpsed, particularly on a large scale, it eclipses all other images of a place in the human psyche. For the imagery of destruction and devastation has its own, mesmerizing, majesty, both to view and to ponder. Grandeur is somehow grander in its disintegrated form.

Throughout this exploration of the architecturally inflected language of Euripides, the walls of Troy have remained in the background, but, as in Euripides' play, hardly out of focus. Before we join Poseidon in

[368] See note 6, above.

abandoning his walls to their fate, it is worth observing by way of conclusion that each of the characters mourned by Hecuba in *Trojan Women* is associated with some sort of architecture: Her husband Priam dies at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, her daughter Cassandra has been raped having sought refuge at the statue in the temple of Athena, her daughter Polyxena has been sacrificed at the tomb of Achilles, the body of her son Hector has been dragged around the walls, and her grandson Astyanax is thrown from the ramparts. To which list might be added Hecuba, herself, in whose figure Anne P. Burnett sees an encapsulation of the qualities of the city of Troy "in its grandeur" which led to its destruction by the gods—including extravagant wealth, overweening pride, a lack of seriousness, a tendency to luxury and excess—as well as a reflection of the city's destiny. It is as if, in Euripides' treatment, as an amalgam of both its past and its present, the queen *is* the city: As Burnett puts it, "Hecuba in particular distills in her tired flesh the whole destiny of Troy, and in the Helen scene she shows herself a true representative of that city as it has been portrayed."[369]

The power of such images to engender pathos is dependent upon each audience member's ability, without the assistance of elaborate stage scenery, to perform a proper visual match, whether based on contemporary, fifth-century monumental topography or one cobbled together out of a diffuse, and likely imprecise, understanding of the archaeology of the glorious past. I would submit that each time one of these characters is mentioned, the particular category of monument associated with him or her comes also to mind, in lieu of direct reference, visually reiterating the play's architectural theme. In this way, and perhaps unique to *Trojan Women*, the architecture of Troy has been built into the very architecture of the play. Whether through direct and frequent reference, allusion, or, to some degree or another, scenic backdrop, the topography of Troy, epitomized by its famous walls, forces its way into prominence almost to the point at which it might be considered a fourth actor. I have tried to show how this is achieved primarily through the medium of language, an organism which, in ancient hands, observes but a slim psychic border between the literal and the metaphorical, thereby disallowing any real distinction between wall as massive stony surround and wall as archetypal emblem of civilized human occupation, a distinction which moderns

---

369 Anne P. Burnett, "*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede Ode," *Yale Classical Studies* 25 (1977), 291–316 (311–312), in a generally unfavorable interpretation of the wife of Priam in *Tr*.

might prefer to preserve. Without a trace of incongruity, the cityscape enlists the audience's sympathy, both as a metaphorical template for the human travails played out in its midst and as a visible, tangible report of a once thriving urban metropolis having gone to ruin, to a degree unparalleled in Classical drama and eclipsed only, arguably, by Homer, who had thousands more lines of poetry through which to accomplish the effect. As Hecuba, at the end of her opening monody (*Tr.* 146–152), leads off a song of lamentation for the burning, war-ravaged city, she is at once reminded of the peaceable city that she knew at its zenith as a queenly young bride, presenting the audience with an ironic juxtaposition of cityscapes, one real, one imagined that, as Thomas J. Sienkewicz has pointed out, will recall the famous pairing of two (different) cities, one at peace, the other, at war, on the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18.[370] For Hecuba, the earlier, and now transitory, cityscape is a paradise in which youth and beauty and music and dance must have seemed the god-given prerogative of the rich, the powerful, and the high-placed in a society that epitomized wealth and the privileges that it bestows on its fortunate, if temporary, possessors. It is an image that will haunt the audience and taunt the protagonists throughout the remainder of the play, a vision rendered sour and discordant in the face of a very different reality, a vision fled, as is the music.[371]

---

[370] Sienkewicz, "Euripides' *Trojan Women*," pp. 89–90, to my mind, does not make as much as he might have of this intriguing observation. For the earlier song, which is "not at all the same" (οὐ τὰν αὐτάν, v. 148) as the present one, he compares specifically *Il.* 18. 491–496, whose idyllic sentiments, which include brides being led from their homes and bridal songs and dances getting underway, seem neatly to parallel that of Hecuba's reminiscences, even if the language of the latter (albeit, the text is problematic; Diggle obelizes 147–148; see Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 89, for the problems) seems more Lyric than Homeric. As he is mostly concerned with the ironic undertones of the *Tr.* passage, Sienkewicz does not pursue an analysis of comparative imagery and language among the various genres, which could prove fruitful.

[371] In homage to the last line of John Keats' great sonnet of 1819, "Ode to a Nightingale": "Fled is that music … Do I wake or sleep?"

CHAPTER TWO

SCULPTURE

Introduction

Euripides' mimetic evocations of the world of sculpted images provide some of the most compelling evidence for his reputed attention to οἰκεῖα πράγματα. "The things of everyday life," indeed, for in antiquity statues were an inescapable daily spectacle for the masses, rather than a temporary source of intellectual engagement for the enlightened few, as in modern times. The Athenians were particularly afflicted with what has aptly been called the "statue habit."[1] To the population of fifth-century Athens, statues were the most highly developed and effective visual media, the cutting-edge of their day. There was no way to avoid them. Little wonder that the poets considered themselves in competition with the statue-makers, both for business and for the ideological high-ground of art and immortality. While we have no equivalent to the opening of Pindar's *Nemean* 5 from a sculptor's point of view, we do know that poets and sculptors regularly encroached upon one another's artistic terrain, with the poets frequently referring to statues and the sculptors inscribing words, often poetry, on the bases of statues in order to augment the communicative power of their works. All of this activity is in acknowledgment of the fact that poetry and sculpture are truly sister arts. They share a special relationship with nature, in that they are both imitative or representational art forms, in a fairly straightforward way, as distinguished from architecture, which is not mimetic, and also from painting, whose far more problematic relationship with nature involves manifold illusionistic compromises of the sort later codified by Plato. Because poets are in essence mimicking the mimicked when they evoke statues and the language of statuary, there is an added degree of complexity to these references and allusions, a byproduct of the special relationship between the

[1] R.R.R. Smith, "Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit," in *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, S. Hornblower and C. Morgan, eds. (Oxford, 2007), pp. 83–139.

two art forms. Hence, as we shall see, the language of sculpture in Euripides carries even greater potential for ambiguity and multivalent interpretation than was the case with architecture. How this is accomplished and how it reflects upon the playwright's artistry are the subjects of this chapter.

References and allusions in literature to statues and to the art and craft of statue-making have received a great deal of long-overdue scholarly attention in recent years. Among a plethora of interdisciplinary work by philologists and literary critics who have belatedly turned their attention to the material remains of the civilization whose written texts they study, Deborah Tarn Steiner's *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought* (Princeton and Oxford, 2001) stands out for the rigor of its archaeological and art historical research, for its incisive analyses of works of art, and for its thorough canvassing of the relevant material. With this book Steiner has made a substantial, and in many ways defining, contribution to the cross-disciplinary field of literature and art. However, owing to the broad scope of her study, she does not linger on the works of Euripides, limiting her discussion to a handful of the most prominent statuary references in the corpus, leaving room for the present author to fill in some of the gaps. To single out a fresh guiding principle with which to approach the use of statuary in Euripides is, however, no easy task. The body of evidence is far from unfamiliar; it includes some of the finest and most heavily scrutinized images in all of Greek literature. The following examination, while still not exhaustive of the material, in keeping with the aims set out in the preface, focuses primarily on individual instances of the playwright's language and how it functions to advance subtle aspects of the plots of the plays.

ἄγαλμα and ἀγάλματα

With some 56 occurrences in his extant work, it is fair to say that Euripides is fond of the word ἄγαλμα. This may be compared with twelve in Aeschylus and three in Sophocles. Even after adjusting these figures for the differences in number of plays preserved, Euripides emerges as the most habitual adopter of the term. By contrast it occurs only eight times in Homer and five in Pindar.[2] The term is a staple of dedicatory

[2] *TLG*, s. v.

inscriptions—to no surprise, as we have already seen how frequently Euripides' architectural language is paralleled in epigraphical texts. Our playwright uses ἄγαλμα in three different ways: first, in its original connotative sense, as a "thing of delight;" second, to refer to accouterments or ornaments, usually of the dead; and third, to refer to statues and monuments. This chapter concerns itself chiefly with the last, though we shall see how vestiges of the original, abstract meaning of the term persist even when it is used concretely, and vice versa, opening up the possibility of variant interpretations of individual passages.

Statues, in concept and as a reality of an ancient Greek's daily existence, are put to multiple dramaturgical uses in Euripides' plays. In some cases, such as *Iphigenia among the Taureans*, *Helen*, *Andromache*, and *Hippolytus*, statues can be the pivots around which the action of a play revolves. Yet even when they are relatively incidental to the plot, statues may figure in less conspicuous, but still significant ways, while the language of statues may contribute to the play's poetics. People talk to statues and, as if in response, statues move of their own accord, an impossibility to the modern mind, but the sort of thing that occasionally occurred in the ancient world (or so we are informed by some very intelligent people, which merits a respectful suspension of our disbelief).[3] Statues are seized from their pedestals and carted off in a consequence-laden series of events that periodically happened in real life, as well.[4] They are cradled in arms; they are garlanded, supplicated, and worshipped, again in true-to-ancient-life fashion.[5] They show up in domestic as well as in religious contexts throughout the corpus of Euripides, as we know to have been the case in real life. People express interest in becoming statues—which, whether it happened in life, is a virtual trope in Euripidean tragedy—and they compare themselves to statues.[6] Characters strike statue-like poses,

[3] Statues moving of their own accord: *IT* 1165–1167; people talking to statues: *Hipp.* 73–87, 1461, etc., *Ph.* 631–632. Monica De Cesare, *Le statue in imagine. Studi sulle raffigurazioni di statue nella pittura vascolare greca* (Rome, 1997), pp. 79–91, with figs. 31–41, assembles and discusses images on vases that she identifies convincingly as animated or moving statues, contrasting them with images of stationary statues; R. Kassel, "Dialoge mit Statuen," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 51 (1983), 1–12, discusses the trope of the talking statue. The modern literature on the subject is extensive; see, e.g., Kenneth Gross, *The Dream of the Moving Statue* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1992); Steiner, *Images in Mind*, passim, esp. pp. 156–184.

[4] Seized: *IT*; threat to sieze: *Andr.* 266–268; real-life thefts of statues: e.g., Hdt. 1. 183.

[5] Cradled in arms: *IT* 1158; garlanded: *Hipp.* 82–83. Steiner, *Images in Mind*, pp. 105–113, chronicles such cult-related activity in real life.

[6] Interest in becoming a statue: *Hec.* 836–838; comparing oneself to a statue: *Tr.* 193.

a meta-theatrical reference to what likely happened on the tragic stage,[7] and are referred to as if they were statues.[8] Most impressive, however, are the examples of Euripides' exploiting the technical language of statue-making. Although relatively rare, such examples offer the most compelling evidence of a keen interest in, and possibly first-hand acquaintance with, actual sculptural practices. These, often little noticed passages provide exactly the kind of "Morellian" detail that reveals the "hand" of the artist,[9] in this case, demonstrating Euripides' heightened attention to the visual arts and crafts and the potential they offered for imagery, metaphor, and figure of speech.

We begin with *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, which features a statue more prominently than any other Euripidean play. The audience is prepared for this early on: At *IT* 85–90 Orestes reveals that he has been instructed by an oracle of Apollo to sail to the land of the Taurians with the intent to steal and bring back to Athens the *agalma* of Artemis. This *agalma*, we are old, is a sacred cult image which, in typical ancient fashion, had "fallen from the sky" (ὅ φασιν ἐνθάδε / ἐς τούσδε ναοὺς οὐρανοῦ πεσεῖν ἄπο, vv. 87–88), a vital piece of information that from this point forward, as a constant reminder of its highly prized primitive physical appearance, attaches itself as an epithet of one form or another whenever the statue is named (e.g., διοπετές, v. 977).[10] Only this act, the tormented young man is assured, will bring him respite from the life of hardship imposed upon him by the gods as punishment for matricide. This in essence is the plot of *IT*, with a number of unexpected twists and turns and a happy dénouement. In *Trojan Women*, as argued in the previ-

[7] Herbert Golder, "Making a Scene: Gesture, Tableau, and the Tragic Chorus," *Arion* 4 (1996), 1–19.

[8] Thetis as a *deus ex machina* is greeted by the chorus at first as if she were her statue at *Andr*. 1226–1227, as I argue below; the typical wife who is the bane of the house is compared unfavorably to an *agalma* at *Hipp*. 631.

[9] The influential yet controversial Morellian method of identifying artistic "hands" (named after the nineteenth-century connoisseur Giovanni Morelli, who used it to identify the works of Renaissance painters) involves careful analysis of details such as ear lobes, fingernails, eyelids, and drapery. For a recent discussion of the method, see Mary Beard, "Mrs. Arthur Strong, Morelli, and the Troopers of Cortés," in *Ancient Art and its Historiography*, A.A. Donohue and Mark D. Fullerton, eds. (Cambridge, Eng., 2003), pp. 148–170.

[10] On this unusual epithet, see Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes*, pp. 108–110, with earlier references, who reviews the ancient occurrences of the term and discusses the concept of a statue fallen from the sky and its possible connection with meteorites. Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 319, notes that "the word is first used by Euripides in extant Greek," citing also fr. 971 (Incert.).

ous chapter, the opening reference to the city's walls raises expectations of architectural language and allusions in the play to come, so the mention of the statue early in *IT* prepares its audience to expect allusive imagery and language associated with statuary.

To reinforce its role as centerpiece of the play the sacred image is repeatedly invoked by way of the standard array of ancient terminology for such figures: as an ἄγαλμα fourteen times, as a βρέτας twelve times, and once as a ξόανον; it is also alluded to indirectly several times.[11] We come to know that the statue is "polished" (ξεστόν) at *IT* 111–112. At v. 1223 we learn that it is outfitted as an ancient cult figure should be: θεᾶς κόσμους is likely a reference to a peplos and other ornaments which actually adorned the image.[12] When at v. 1158 Iphigenia appears cradling the statue in her arms, the audience are witness to the climactic visual moment of the play. As if in direct response to this Euripidean image, Pausanias (7. 26. 5) curiously reverses the roles of girl and statue when he describes a temple to Artemis in the Peloponnesus that houses a statue of the goddess "in the modern style" (ἄγαλμα τέχνης τῆς ἐφ' ἡμων), whereas an "ancient *agalma*" (ἄγαλμα ἀρχαῖον) in this same temple is said to be of Iphigenia! Pausanias deduces that the temple must originally have been dedicated to the daughter of Agamemnon, with the goddess' image as a later interloper. Might Euripides have been inspired by the multiple mimetic paradoxes presented by the existence of such odd pairings of statues to create his memorable tableau at *IT* 1158, where a live girl whose beauty is certainly "in the modern style" holds an archaic-looking image? The prophecies of Athena at the end of Euripides' play reflect an awareness of ancient local cults of Iphigenia similar to the one mentioned by Pausanias and suggest that direct influence is plausible.[13]

In the play that bears her name, Andromache, the former daughter-in-law of Priam, now the concubine of Neoptolemus (who has since taken a "real" Greek wife, Hermione), has already lost one child (Astyanax) and the life of her second, bastard son is threatened. Forced to be a slave to the new wife, Andromache supplicates a statue of Thetis, the mother of the man who killed her husband, in a shrine to the goddess in the vicinity

---

[11] Gilbert Norwood, *Essays on Euripidean Drama* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA, 1954), p. 23, observes: "In Orestes' mouth the phrase 'goddess' image' becomes a sort of incantation; this object is mentioned twenty-six times in all and grows tiresome, perhaps faintly ridiculous."

[12] Cf. Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 161; Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 246.

[13] For Iphigenia in cult, see Jennifer Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults* (Madison, WI, 1995), pp. 15, 104–106, 118, and passim.

of Neoptolemus' house: ἃς ὕπο τειρομένα/ πρὸς τόδ' ἄγαλμα θεᾶς ἱκέτις περὶ χεῖρε βαλοῦσα / τάκομαι ὡς πετρίνα πιδακόεσσα λιβάς ("Worn down by whom [Hermione], having embraced with my arms as a suppliant this, the *agalma* of the goddess, I am dissolved in tears, just as a stream tumbling headlong over rocks," *Andr.* 114–116). This beautiful, sorrowful, image is worthy of a Victorian funerary monument. In comparing her emotional state to a stream rushing over rocks, as scholars have noted, Andromache is aware that her sorrow is akin to that of Niobe, who was turned to stone in her grief over the deaths of her children at the hands of Apollo and Artemis and forced to "shed tears" of rainwater for eternity.[14] None of this is directly stated. However, the simile is all but reiterated at vv. 532–534, where Andromache comes much closer to equating herself directly with the rock that is covered by a stream (of flowing tears) and, although Niobe is still not named, she seems again to be the target of the simile: λείβομαι δάκρυσιν κόρας, / στάζω λισσάδος ὡς πέτρας / λιβὰς ἀνάλιος, ἁ τάλαινα ("I am drenched with tears, from my eyes, I drip, a wretched one, as a rock made smooth by a flowing stream untouched by the sun").[15] Granted I have taken some liberties with cases and modifiers in my translation; however, as Andromache is obviously speaking in agitated, lyric measures, a degree of freedom with syntax seems justified. That the simile with a rock is direct in this case is underscored when Menelaus immediately co-opts the image at v. 537, identifying *himself* as an impenetrable, immovable, "rock" indifferent to the entreaties of mother and son.

Andromache's two similes must be interpreted together. At *Andr.* 114–116 the juxtaposition of *agalma* (in this case, an actual one) with a verbal image, as at *IT* 273–274, encourages the blending of the two

[14] Paley^2 2, p. 247; Hyslop, *Andromache*, p. 65; Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 110; indirectly, Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 113. All of these commentators associate the Euripidean passage with S. *Ant.* 823–831, where Antigone relates the story of Niobe.

[15] Cf. Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 161, who is somewhat more reserved in this opinion. Pucci, "The Monument and the Sacrifice," p. 162, n. 20 (cf. Hyslop, *Andromache*, pp. 96–97; Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 134, in reference to the present passage), associates the imagery of Niobe's rock as "an example of permanent mourning" with metaphors of streams springing from rocks, citing *Il.* 16. 2–4, where Patroclus is crying, and 24. 602–620, where the story of Niobe is related in full; he also cites parallel weeping and wasting scenes in E., including *Andr.* 116, *Supp.* 78–86 and *Med.* 24–29. On rocks as metaphors for unyielding, steadfast, or intractable humans, in senses good and bad, with a focus on E.'s own Medea, see Deborah Boedeker, "Becoming Medea: Assimilation in Euripides," in *Medea. Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, eds. James J. Clauss and Sarah. I. Johnston (Princeton, 1997), pp. 129–130 and 139.

semantic and notional units into one, with the result that we should regard Andromache as comparing herself to a statue; in the second simile, *agalma* is not needed, since it is semantically and notionally replaced by "rock." From the further clues provided by the verbal imagery of vv. 114–116 we may infer that we are meant to think of Niobe. Whether a statue of her or her very person becomes irrelevant, since the woman was turned into stone.[16] In invoking Niobe *as a statue* Euripides is mimicking in proleptic fashion, while at the same time punning upon, the divine mimetic act that would result in a kind of immortality being bestowed prematurely and without bidding on this most unfortunate of mothers: petrification. Therewith, owing to the contingent circumstances of this particular myth, there is no pressing need to identify specific statues of Niobe that could have served as the source of inspiration for Andromache's being compared with a statue. However, we do know of a group of Niobids from ca. 430, which are thought to have decorated a pediment from an unknown Greek temple and which were taken to Rome and reworked and/or copied, that would qualify.[17] It includes both male and female Niobids, as well as Apollo, Artemis, and very likely Niobe, herself.

The sculptural group itself is not without its problems. Curiously, considering the quality and scale of the figures, no such group is attested in ancient literature, and the diversity of the members of the "group" present many difficulties that place in question whether or not they belong together, including differences in scale, issues of placement, and whether or not all are in fact figures from this particular myth. While Artemis and Apollo have been identified, albeit not without controversy, none of the figures has been identified as Niobe, herself, although she surely would

---

[16] Pausanias (1. 21. 3) claims to have seen the image of Niobe on Mt. Sipylus in Magnesia, where the legendary scene was supposed to have taken place (cf. *Il.* 24. 602–620), and provides a description: "When you are near it is a beetling crag, with not the slightest resemblance to a woman, mourning or otherwise; but if you go further away you will think you see a woman in tears with head bowed down" (trans. W.H.S. Jones, *Pausanias Description of Greece*, 1 [1918; repr. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1978]). After considering possible topographical sources for P.'s reference, Frazer, 2, p. 555, wisely concludes: "It seems obvious, indeed, that a rock of the kind described by Pausanias cannot be identified with any approach to certainty or even probability. It is very much a matter of individual fancy whether a particular rock resembles a woman or not."

[17] The best discussion is Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, *Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture* (Princeton, 1981), pp. 54–59, with figs. 25–32, and a convenient list of the twelve sculptures that have been associated with this monument, p. 55.

have been represented. Another extant work of art, the namepiece of the Early Classical Niobid Painter (Louvre G 431), likely reflects an earlier monumental painted or sculpted group of Niobids.[18] Pausanias (5. 11. 2) says that the slaughter of the Niobids decorated part of the throne of Pheidias' cult statue of Zeus at Olympia, reliefs which are thought to be reflected in a Roman copy.[19] Pausanias (1. 21. 3) intriguingly mentions a set of Niobids associated with a cave located "at the height of the theatre" (ἐν δὲ τῇ κορυφῇ τοῦ θεάτρου) in the rock under the south wall of the acropolis that still can be seen today; either these were statues in the cave or else they decorated a tripod that was housed there, which Pausanias also mentions, and which is thought to have formed part of an elaborate Doric choregic monument of the late fourth or early third century BC, remnants of which have been found at the mouth of this cave.[20] However, the ambiguous locative ἐν αὐτῷ does leave open the possibility that the statue group was in the cave and independent of this choregic monument. As J.G. Frazer observes: "If he [Pausanias] had meant to describe the group as a relief on the tripod he would have said not 'in it' (ἐν αὐτῷ), but 'on it' (ἐπ' αὐτῷ), and would probably have added the participle ἐπειργασμένοι." Frazer does not, however, disassociate the Niobid group from the choregic monument.[21] Another possible source of inspiration for the Niobe imagery in Euripides' *Andromache* has been suggested by Herbert Golder, who compares vase-paintings of Andromache and seated female mourning figures from contemporary Attic grave reliefs and elsewhere in Greek art.[22] There are thus plenty of suitable comparanda.

The monumental Niobid group, if scholars are correct about its subject and date, might also have inspired Sophocles' haunting, extended rendition of the Niobid story by Antigone at *Ant.* 823–831, a passage which is often cited in support of introducing Niobe into Euripides' ultimately more subtle allusions at *Andr.* 115–116 and 532–534.[23] Interest-

---

[18] John Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Classical Period* [London, 1989] [hereafter cited as Boardman, *ARVC*], fig. 4. 1; Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, p, 319.

[19] Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, fig. 375.

[20] Frazer, 2, pp. 230–231.

[21] Frazer, op. cit., p. 231.

[22] Golder, "Making a Scene," p. 9, with n. 28.

[23] See note 14, above; the date of *Ant.* is contested; Scott Scullion, "Tragic Dates," *Classical Quarterly* 52 (2002), 81–101 (85–86), considers it early, perhaps the "earliest" of S.'s extant works, at ca. 450.

ingly, Antigone is also associated with the Niobids in Euripides, albeit indirectly, when she peers into the distance at her brother, Polyneices, as he stands close by the tomb of the Niobids at *Ph.* 159–162.[24] However, the fortuitous alliance of stone statue and tears of entreaty or sorrow that constitute her present circumstances alone could have put Andromache in mind of the plight of Niobe. In the earlier passage it could be that the statue of Thetis, itself, is the referent for "rocky," in the sense of "statuesque," with Andromache expressing her anguish that in her supplication it seems as if she were pouring herself over the statue, to no avail, while in the later passage, in which the statue is not mentioned, it is her own body that Andromache is calling "rocky," in other words, "like a statue of Niobe" or just "like Niobe," over which (or whom) her endless tears are dripping. With multiple levels of mimetic activity available for the tapping in the simile, it is up to the individual reader/listener to find his or her way through its conceptual implications.

Similar is Hecuba's allying her degraded self with a kind of statue at *Tr.* 192–193: ὡς … νεκροῦ μορφά, / νεκύων ἀμενηνὸν ἄγαλμα ("[I am] as … a living corpse, a bleary *agalma* of the dead"). In this double-tiered overture she seems to be moving in sentiment from matter-of-fact recognition of her state to wishing it were something else. She accomplishes this in two stages, first, by iterating her status as a frail impersonation of a living being, in form (μορφά), if not in substance, a corpse, and following this with a more developed bid for displacement from the present reality by further characterizing this μορφά as not as a real corpse but an *image* of a corpse. Hecuba is therefore declaring herself a facsimile of a facsimile, since a corpse without its *psyche* is no more than a residual human being, an empty shell that, like a statue, presents visual evidence only of its humanity, and that too will vanish within hours; compare the ἄψυχον εἰκώ that Jason's doomed young bride sees in her dressing mirror (*Med.* 1162). Two striking, statuary-inflected words, one oblique, one direct (μορφά, ἄγαλμα), together articulate Hecuba's attempt to will her sorrow onto a surrogate.[25] The *agalma* that she pictures, however, lacks the heft of a dead body, which it also cannot pass for, since it still lives and moves. A statue, on the other hand, like a

---

[24] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 195, cites conflicting ancient literary evidence for an actual tomb of the Niobids at Thebes.

[25] Cf. Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 98: "Hecuba describes herself in striking words. The repetition in νεκροῦ μορφά, νεκύων … ἄγαλμα is especially effective." Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 148, also notes the dual images and attempts to preserve both in a nuanced translation.

soul, is able to move, at least in the popular imagination. But neither can this statue lay claim to the solidity of stone; it is fleeting, insubstantial, ineffectual (ἀμενηνόν).[26]

There is yet a bright note among these sentiments. Hecuba is an old woman, but we cannot think of a Hellenistic-era statuary type here; this is fifth-century Athens. Rather the *agalma* that Hecuba imagines would have to be an idealized image of a wife and mother in her prime of life, a fully restored version of the haggard wretch that she has become. The former queen may thus long to be made beautiful again by her sorrow, a secondary consolation that accompanies its being temporarily transposed onto the surrogate. Some of the same may be said of Oedipus at *Ph.* 1543–1545, who compares his woeful old self to a tricolon of categories of similacra: πολιὸν αἰθερῶδες εἴδωλον ἢ / νέκυν ἔνερθεν ἢ / πτανὸν ὄνειρον ("a hoary, ethereal *eidôlon* or a corpse from the netherworld or a winged dream").[27] There is some irony involved in modifying εἴδωλον with πολιόν, as the intervention of αἰθερῶδες makes clear; Classical Greek statues are not normally inflected with "the pallor of decrepitude" and other kinds of *eidôla* seem to be bright and shining rather than grey, pale, or indistinct.[28] There is, to modern eyes and ears, a touch of beauty about this image of old age as a state of being so

---

[26] Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 167, reads *Tr.* 193 differently. Noting that ἀμενηνός is "used in Homer of the dead" in the normal sense of "weak" or "feeble," she sees here "an unHomeric oxymoron" that is "produced by the linking with *agalma*." Thus, "Hecuba is being ironical in seeing herself as a poor sort of adornment even to the dead." Barlow translates: "a feeble adornment of the dead." Barlow might also have cited *HF* 703, where νεκρῶν ἀγάλμασιν can mean nothing other than "adornment of the dead," in a literal sense (cf. *Alc.* 613; *Tr.* 1212, 1220; *Or.* 1434–1435); on the other hand, *HF* 357–358 (cf. 425) where the *aretai* of noble labors are an *agalma* for the dead (τοῖς θανοῦσιν), the usage is figurative.

[27] I adopt the text of Kovacs, *Euripides* 5, with αἰθερῶδες (Willink), as I do not find Diggle's emendation αἰθεροφαές ("shining with the brightness of ether," according to Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 581) in LSJ or its supplements. Mastronarde goes with αἰθέρος ἀφανές of the mss., and discusses the problems of meter and sense that this image presents (pp. 580–581). Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women*, p. 259, calls the imagery of *Ph.* 1543–1545 "commonplace," citing as parallels *Tr.* 192–193, just discussed; A. *Ag.* 81–82 (where very old age is compared to a child and a daydream); S. *OC* 109–110 (the elderly Oedipus as an *eidôlon* of his former self) and 1211–1248 (a lengthy lyric evocation of the vagaries of a troubled old age); see also the comparanda of Mastronarde, op. cit., p. 580. These examples, however, are instructive in revealing how E. distinguishes himself from the others by his choice of language often associated with statuary and for his piling up of a range of words for different categories of similacra.

[28] Cf. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, pp. 580–581; I quote from p. 581 somewhat out of context, as the author does not entertain the possibility of statues being referenced here.

light as to verge on phosphorescence, delicate as a silver-point drawing, and weightless, therefore to be borne with greater ease than youth and maturity. Pauer associates both the present passage and *Tr.* 192–193, with images on grave stelai.[29]

Heracles, an altogether simpler of mind and more earth-bound tragic figure than either Hecuba or Oedipus, in what has been aptly called a "crucial existential moment"[30] at *HF* 1397, speaking in character, but for comparable reasons, expresses a wish to become a rock, insensate and mindless of the evils he has inflicted and the pain he will suffer on their account.[31] It is as if, as with Niobe, petrification serves to put a merciful end to suffering, while, at the same time, conserving the image of the body at the peak of its grief, a form of eternal, but ultimately painless, punishment. Hecuba and Oedipus desire not petrification, but release of another form, the gift of corporal insubstantiality. Only Niobe, however, will be granted entry into this blessed state of freedom from suffering. Perhaps affiliated with this image is the rock that Athena hurled at Heracles' chest at *HF* 1004, which knocked him senseless and put an end to the rampage. Pausanias (9. 11. 2) appears to have seen this very stone, named Σωφρονιστῆρα ("Chastiser"), at Thebes either in the house of Amphitryon or at the tomb of the slaughtered children.[32] In another potential postscript to *HF* 1397, Pausanias (9. 24. 3) visits a temple of Heracles at Hyettus that housed a healing "image" (of Heracles?) ὄντος οὐχὶ ἀγάλματος σὺν τέχνῃ, λίθου δὲ ἀγροῦ κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ("being an image not made with skill, but a rough stone, as in the old way"). So too the periphrasis "stony piles" (λαΐνοισί τ' ἐξογκώμασιν, *HF* 1331–1333) used of monuments to be erected at Athens in honor of Heracles, a rather strange way of referring to temples, might appear more sensible in light of the role of rocks in this play. Rehm makes the interesting suggestion that these refer to, among other possibilities, the numerous sculptural representations of Heracles that could be seen on temples in the Athens of Euripides' day.[33]

We may now return to the statue of Thetis that is the nucleus around which the statuary similes in *Andromache* revolve. Andromache's

---

[29] Pauer, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*, p. 104.

[30] Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 112.

[31] Cf. Theognis 568–569: λίθος ἄφθογγος, on which see Andrew Ford, *The Origins of Criticism. Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton and Oxford, 2002), p. 104, with n. 38.

[32] Cf. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 320.

[33] Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 112.

insinuating assertion that the image "glowers" at her rival Hermione (ὁρᾷς ἄγαλμα Θέτιδος ἐς σ᾽ ἀποβλέπον; *Andr.* 246) deserves closer attention. Hermione, not one to be intimidated, retorts in the very next line that, on the contrary, the goddess' statue "hates" Andromache's homeland, Troy, on account of the murder of her son, Achilles. Our interest lies in the fact that the differences of opinion aired in this chilly exchange imply a statue that possesses a facial expression that may be variously interpreted. In this case I suspect that an Archaic rather than a Classical female type is to be preferred. First, the gaze of a Classical statue is more likely than not to be meaningfully directed toward a specific target or purpose, leaving little room, it would seem, for interpretation of its "mood." On the other hand, for the kore type that proliferated in the Archaic Greek world, the gaze appears at the same time ambiguously undirected, yet constant and unwavering in its aim, precisely because it is limited by style and format to a single, forward direction. This is the case even when, on occasion, the kore's gaze appears (perhaps artificially so owing to the incomplete state of preservation of polychromy) to be directed inward.[34] Thus its gaze can be said to possess no intrinsic meaning, thereby allowing for the viewer, or, in the case of Andromache and Hermione, the viewed, to characterize it in any way he or she chooses. Because it has no evident "agenda," the look of a kore can be read as indicative of all manner of dispositions or none at all.

Second, the inscrutable "Archaic smile" that is one of the trademark characteristics of the type and which is commonly credited with bestowing upon its possessors the generic quality of youthful beauty and vigor, is just that, inscrutable, and thus allows for any number of readings. Most of the korai do feature the smile but by no means do they smile in the same way; in other words, expressions, such as they are, vary among the extant examples, especially among those from the Athenian acropolis. A sampling of the smiles of these statues is instructive. Compare acropolis kore 674's pleasant, but enigmatic look, which barely qualifies as a smile, with the dazzling, confident beam of kore 696 and the coy, seductive grin of kore 616.[35] A number of korai wear only a trace of the Archaic smile, none

[34] Cf. the interpretation of the gaze of the korai by Robin Osborne, "Looking on—Greek Style. Does the Sculpted Girl Speak to Women too?," in *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies*, ed. Ian Morris (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), pp. 81–96, and my own in *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai* (Austin, TX, 2004), pp. 42–82, some of which is reiterated here.

[35] Katerina Karakasi, *Archaic Korai* (2001; Eng. ed. Los Angeles, CA, 2003), pls. 272, 265, 276, respectively.

at all, or a downright frown; examples include acropolis figures 672, 684, 685, and 686. While a few, most noticeably, kore 661, from some angles, appear to glower.[36] All in all the faces of Archaic statues of females exhibit a surprisingly broad range of expressive potentiality compared with the uniformly more bland expressions of typical Classical female statues such as, to cite just one example from the same site as the acropolis korai, the Erechtheum caryatids. For this reason, I propose that Euripides means us to envision the statue of Thetis in his *Andromache* as an Archaic image.

True, the floruits of the Acropolis korai and the Archaic style itself present chronological obstacles, though they are not insurmountable. It is possible that Euripides in his extreme youth might just have remembered these statues in their heyday before the Persian destruction of the acropolis and subsequent burial of the debris that was left behind. At any rate, still in good condition (to judge from their appearances upon excavation in the late 1800s and in the Acropolis Museum today), they were not buried immediately following the departure of the Persian forces. One kore, Acr. 688, was incorporated into the foundations of the Periclean Propylaia as late as 438/7 BC. Others might still have stood in their damaged states or remained visible on the ground for many years while the so-called Oath of Plataea was in effect.[37] Even if they were no longer

---

[36] Karakasi, *Archaic Korai*, pls. 150a, 194, 191, 278, 170, respectively.

[37] Acr. 688: Gisela M.A. Richter, *Korai. Archaic Greek Maidens. A Study of the Development of the Kore Type in Greek Sculpture* (London, 1968), p. 102, with figs. 587–590. To gain a picture of the condition of the acropolis between the Persian destruction and the resumption of work on the Parthenon is an elusive proposition; the archaeological evidence and the history of its interpretation are often muddled; hence, opinions vary. In her monograph on the korai, Karakasi, *Archaic Korai*, p. 130, observes that the inconclusive evidence surrounding some members of the acropolis group "raises the question whether they were perhaps set up only after the citadel's destruction by the Persians," though she does not pursue the idea further. In the most recent reexamination of the archaeological evidence, Andrew Stewart, "The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions of 480 B.C.E. and the Beginning of the Classical Style: Part 1, The Stratigraphy, Chronology, and Significance of the Acropolis Deposits," *American Journal of Archaeology* 112 (2008), 377–412, advocates a lowered chronology for the earliest classical works from the acropolis, and the Severe style itself as a completely post-Persian phenomenon, even suggesting (p. 394) that one of the cohort, which happens also to be one of the finest of the korai, Acr. 686/609, "Euthydikos' kore" (his fig. 17 shows a cast of the two fragments united), may date from "the 470s or later." Stewart, op. cit., esp. pp. 390–391, 405, presents the post-Persian acropolis as one continuous, disruptive construction site through the 470s; at no point need we imagine a sense of urgency to obliterate all evidence of the Archaic style. While my own study of the acropolis korai was concerned primarily with their identity and meaning rather than with issues of dating (Stieber, *The Poetics of Appearance*), I tend to the view that the archaic style did not simply disappear from the acropolis and from collective memory in 480/79, but that it lingered indefinitely.

visible, there is strong evidence to suggest that Classical Athenians preserved a collective memory of these statues. The Erechtheum caryatids were referred to as "korai" in their day (*IG* I^3 474. 86); most agree that this is in homage to the Archaic statues.[38] R.R. Holloway has proposed that the Parthenon frieze is an attempt to recreate the appearance of the Archaic acropolis, evoking statuary types including reincarnations of the korai in the maidens from the East frieze.[39] Moreover, it is well to recall that the Greek archaic remained a stylistic option throughout the remainder of antiquity, and was often adopted for representations of (usually female) statues in both vases and sculpture;[40] clearly this is a case of either collective memory or the continued preservation of authentic archaic artifacts, if not a little of both. In sum it is not impossible for Euripides to have been familiar with the essential features of the Archaic way of representing females, if not with the most accomplished exemplars of the style, those from his native city.

The ugly confrontation continues between the two women, and the statue in front of them once again provides fodder for a taunt. At *Andr.* 266–268 Hermione assures her hated rival that if necessary she (Hermione) will be able to remove her from Thetis' sanctuary before Neoptolemos arrives even if Andromache were "soldered to a masonry base like a statue" (καὶ γὰρ εἰ πέριξ σ᾽ ἔχοι/τηκτὸς μόλυβδος). The phrase τηκτὸς μόλυβδος ("molten lead") at v. 267 refers to the ring of lead poured around the plinth of a statue to secure it in the bedding of its base, a mundane detail which would seem to have been either invisible or uninteresting to all but those craftsmen who were responsible for attending to the erection of statues. An intact example of a lead ring used for this purpose was found with the kore and kouros from Merenda, excavated in 1972, and provided the key to securing the association of the kore with an inscribed base containing the funerary epitaph of Phrasikleia, resulting in a rare complete Archaic funerary monument.[41] Aristophanes makes

---

[38] Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 206; Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, pp. 167–168.

[39] R.R. Holloway, "The Archaic Acropolis and the Parthenon Frieze," *Art Bulletin* 48 (1966), 223–226.

[40] Cf. the well-known red-figure kalpis by the Kleophrades Painter (fl. ca. 505–475), which shows Cassandra seeking refuge from Ajax beside a statue of Athena (Naples, Museo Nazionale 2422; John Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Archaic Period* [London, 1983] [hereafter cited as Boardman, *ARVA*], fig. 135). There are two recent monographs on this material: De Cesare, *Le statue in imagine*, and Werner Oenbrink, *Das Bild im Bilde. Zur Darstellung von Götterstatuen und Kultbildern auf griechischen Vasen* (Europäische Hochschulschriften Series 38: Archaeology) 64, (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).

[41] Nikolaos Kaltsas, "Die Kore und der Kuros aus Myrrhinous," *Antike Plastik* 28 (2002), 7–40 (7–26, with pls. 1–12; the lead ring can be seen in place in the base in fig. 4).

a joke of the practice at *Ec.* 1108–1111, where an old woman is threatened to be turned into a "bronze" statue by being covered in pitch, then soldered up to her ankles with a lead ring (κύκλῳ), and finally erected over a young man's tomb to take the place of "a lekythos," a common type of funerary monument for the late fifth century. As the process is being described, the body of the old woman is already being referred to as a *sema* (τοῦ σήματος, v. 1108), which is the term frequently used in funerary inscriptions of the Archaic period, of which a life-sized funerary statue like the one imagined here more properly belongs.[42] A fourth-century building inscription from Eleusis (*IG* II^2 1672. 176), records payment to a "lead-pourer" (μολυβδοχοήσαντι, the same technical term used by Aristophanes); likely the craftsman who poured lead to secure clamps in architecture was also employed to secure the plinths of statues. Aristophanes' joke assumes that his audience was familiar with the process whereby monumental statues were attached to their bases, and no doubt some of them were, at least the ones who took the time to read the countless inscriptions that recorded the expenses incurred with all public works. However, there is no reason to assume that a woman would have interest in or knowledge of this technical process. In *Andromache* the unexpected revelation that a woman has this knowledge underscores and embraces the capacity of deftly deployed specialized technical language to startle and intrigue a male audience. Furthermore, while this kind of trivia might pass with little notice in comedy, its presence in a tragedy is noteworthy.

Once again drama is well-served by Euripides' dipping deep into his technical vocabulary in search of a memorable image. Andromache's supplication of the statue of Thetis (*Andr.* 115–116, cf. v. 311) and insinuation that the goddess' likeness shows favor to her rather than to Hermione add vividness and immediacy to the current statuary analogy. Moreover, with this concrete image, I would argue that Euripides, having introduced his statuary simile with restraint on the earlier occasion, begins here to accustom his audience to the idea of Andromache as a statue. Unlike the Niobe analogy at vv. 115–116, reinforced at vv. 532–534, whose lyrical cadences bring Andromache's plight to a full emotional pitch, the language of *Andr.* 266–268 is anchored in the real world of an artisanal product. Language and locution that were original, yet safely tethered to poetic tradition have metamorphosed into the openly technical diction of the craftsman, demonstrating the depth of Euripides' persistence

[42] E.g., that of Phrasikleia, *CEG* #24.

in developing the simile. Its prosaic specificity sharpens the realism of the scene and forces the reader/listener to adjust the aesthetically pleasing mental image likely preserved from the original simile, if my earlier suggestions for statuary prototypes are correct. For the model introduced by the indirect allusion to the petrification of Niobe offers an additional analogy. Like that ill-fated woman (an inevitable conclusion, since she spent a great deal of time weeping over her children's graves before she was transformed into [read: melded with] the very rock on which she wept),[43] it seems that Andromache will be rendered statuesque in slow stages, beginning with her feet: This is an image that borders on the gruesome. It demonstrates the utter contempt Hermione has for Andromache, as if to transfix her literally, to render her permanently ineffectual, would settle their dispute. The insult is perhaps deepened by the use of vocabulary and *pragmata* borrowed from a masculine milieu, although that is certainly not unparalleled in Euripides.

The centrality of the statue of Thetis to the early action of *Andromache* is rounded out by an appearance of the goddess herself as a *deus ex machina* at the play's end (vv. 1226 ff.). By this time the statue has become such a fixture of the drama that the actual goddess is greeted by the chorus at first as if she were her statue, come to life: τί κεκίνηται, τίνος αἰσθάνομαι/θείου; ("What is this thing got into motion, this divine thing that I perceive?", vv. 1226–1227). True, it would not be out of character for Euripides to play upon the fact that an actor is being maneuvered into position via the machine; in that case the passive κεκίνηται would perform double duty, representing both the fictional arrival of the goddess and the actual stage device lumbering into action.[44] But the prominent role of Thetis' image in this play prompts a look beyond the obvious. That said, I would aruge that τί κεκίνηται suggests more the movement of an inanimate object, like a statue, than an animate being (cf. the opening of Pi. *N.* 5). Likewise the other language used of Thetis' apparition, τίνος θείου, is more appropriately used of things that have divine qualities than of divinities themselves, and on more than one occasion, it is used of statues. In fact θεῖος may be thought of as

[43] Cf. Mark Griffith, *Sophocles Antigone* (Cambridge, Eng., 1999), pp. 268–270, ad loc. *Ant.* 823–833.

[44] Cf. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, p. 164, who considers in detail the mechanics of this scene: "The noise made by the device, as it lifts the suspended figure from the interior up into the open air, is illustrated by the verbs κεκίνηται and αἰσθάνομαι, which seem to reflect exclusively acoustic impressions;" referring to αἰσθάνομαι, Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 241, however, finds this "improbable."

an informal art critical term, perhaps as a variation of σεμνός used only of archaic works.[45] A testimonium about the works of Aeschylus (*TrGF* 3 T 114) that includes an analogy with sculpture captures the spirit of this adjective; in it, older statues are said to have been "simpler" (ἁπλῶς) but to have more of the "quality of divinity" (θείου) about them than those of the present day.[46] The epithet is used of a dancing floor at the court of Alkinoös at *Od.* 8. 264, puzzling critics,[47] but needlessly, it would seem, if another Homeric dancing floor is recalled, namely, that made on the shield of Achilles by Hephaistos in imitation of a real χορός made by Daidalos for Ariadne at Knossos (*Il.* 18. 590–592). The floor on the shield was the work of a divinity, but it may be even more significant that Daidalos' works too were reputed to have been ἀτοπώτερα ("rather unnatural") and yet to have τι ἔνθεον ("something of the divine") in them (Paus. 2. 4. 5).[48] Compare εὐαγῆ ("holy"), used of statues made by Daidalos in Euripides' fr. 928a. 2, to be discussed in Chapter Five. If, as its seems, the paradigm was the invention of Daidalos, any dancing floor might fairly earn the epithet θείος.

Thus, in *Andromache*, through language alone, the statue of Thetis is reprised in an invigorated form just before it cedes the stage to the real goddess. If vv. 1226–1227 are interpreted as I suggest, then the chorus' final proclamation that "many are the forms of divinities" (πολλαὶ

---

[45] For σεμνός as an art critical term, see J.J. Pollitt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art* (New Haven and London, 1974) (hereafter cited as Pollitt, *AVGA*), pp. 233–236.

[46] See my discussion of this testimonium in "Aeschylus' *Theoroi*," pp, 97–99, and further, below. For the documented art critical terms ἁπλότης and ἁπλοῦς, see Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 141–143. This same intangible quality peculiar to archaic statuary is called "numen" by Silius Italicus (*Punica* 14. 662–663), who, in a description of the one-time wealth and material glory of ancient Syracuse, mentions "simulacra deorum numen ab arte datum servantia."

[47] Both William B. Stanford, *The Odyssey of Homer*, 1 (1947; 2nd ed. London and New York, 1967), p. 338, and Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West, and J.B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 1 (Oxford, 1990), p. 363, the latter, calling θεῖον "a unique epithet," prefer to regard the χορόν at *Od.* 8. 264 as a reference to the dance itself rather than the floor, even though the same word was just used of the floor at v. 260, as they both note. To see this phrase as an internal accusative seems to me to be unnecessary with πέπληγον, with which it may easily function as a direct object, and ποσίν in the same line. Heubeck et al., loc. cit., cite but reject an emendation by Bérard to λεῖον ('smooth'), obviously in acknowledgment that the χορόν at v. 264 should also mean 'floor'. A.T. Murray and George E. Dimock, *Homer Odyssey*, 1 (1919; 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1995) translate "dancing floor" at v. 264.

[48] On the ancient truism that primitive images had something of the divine about them, see Sarah P. Morris, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton, 1992), p. 248, with further bibliography.

μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων, v. 1284), which initiates a tail-piece familiar from several Euripidean plays, assumes an added relevance specific to this drama in which both statuary and ambrosial forms of Thetis play a role.[49] Having briefly mistaken Thetis for a moving statue, the chorus soon realize that it is the goddess they see before them and not the *agalma* with which they are more familiar. All of the speculation about the statue's "motivation" is cleared up when Thetis herself announces a favorable outcome for Andromache and the Peleid line. Anyway Hermione had apparently given up on the statue when she finds herself wondering "to what divinity's *agalma*" she may go as a suppliant at *Andr*. 859. In any ancient city there would have been plenty of options.

The vast population of images of divinities and semi-divinities in an ancient city would encompass objects ranging from aniconic pillars to chryselephantine colossi. In between were the masses of more modest images erected at small shrines, altars, and cult areas in and around the city and its rural outskirts. Unlike the most sacred images, man-made or natural, that had temples built around them and were the recipients of lavish public cult, the majority of these artifacts were neither great works of art nor objects of mysterious origin; however, they were indispensable to the regular demonstration of religious piety and to the routines of daily life. Pausanias (1. 32. 2) rather dryly observes that the Athenians even place statues of gods in their mountains. A special category is the domestic shrine, which would typically incorporate an image, and which could be found in various rooms inside the home as well as in the courtyard or outside. Most popular in tragedy owing to the large number of preserved dramas that feature suppliants, is the altar of Zeus Herkeios or Soter; its role in *Trojan Women* and *Heracles* have already been touched upon. While all of these categories of objects are a staple of Greek drama, to no surprise, they are found in greater numbers in Euripides' plays than elsewhere. Most of these instances are so well known as to require only a mention in passing.

Domestic cult images are central to the action of *Hippolytus*. Early in the play, as a sign of his allegiance to the virgin goddess, Hippolytus

[49] As Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 246, points out, "these concluding anapaests also appear at the end of *Alc*., *Hel*., *Ba*., and (with a different opening line) *Med*." He goes on to discuss their possible relevance in these plays and in *Andr*., but does not make the deduction I do. Deborah H. Roberts, "Parting Words: Final Lines in Sophocles and Euripides," *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987), 51–64, argues in support of regarding these codas as significant concluding gestures, though she does not comment on the present passage to any great extent.

addresses and plaits with a wreath a statue of Artemis that stands in the vicinity of the palace at Trozen (*Hipp.* 73–87, and so forth), while he keeps his distance from a nearby statue of Aphrodite (τήνδ', v. 101, and so forth). Most assume that both statues were conspicuously represented on the stage.[50] The old man addresses the image of the goddess of love at vv. 115–116, after unsuccessfully advising the young man to do the same; Hippolytus' negligence will set into motion his downfall. A dying Hippolytus later tells Artemis in person that he is the "guardian of her image" (ἀγαλμάτων φύλαξ, v. 1399) and worries that there shall be none to replace him. Indeed, the young man seems more in love with the goddess' statue than with the divinity behind it, to judge from the rather cool, somewhat anti-climactic nature of their face-to-face encounter in the play's final moments. Additional examples from the domestic category include Polyneices bidding farewell to varied *agalmata* of the gods in the palace at Thebes, singling out that of Apollo Agyieus (*Ph.* 631–632). This "god of streets" appears to have been represented for the most part by columns and pillars.[51] However, Mastronarde, who reviews the evidence, suspects that in this case the deity was represented on stage as a real image rather than a pillar; so too Craik, who adds that the "image of Apollo on stage is a constant reminder of his inexorable part in the action."[52] In fr. 781. 246–247 (*Pha.*) statues of the gods in the house of Merops are the likely target of the reference πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ σταθμὰ / θεοῖς.[53] Alcestis stands and prays before what is probably a statue of Hestia at *Alc.* 162; by v. 164, she has dropped to her knees in supplication before the image (σε προσπίτνουσ').

Cult statues from the public sphere are a common feature of Euripidean drama. We have already encountered several prominent examples above; a few more may be added. First, Necessity: At *Alc.* 973–975 the chorus bemoan the fact that the goddess Necessity cannot be approached by way of an altar or an image (βωμοὺς … βρέτας). The chorus are not claiming that the statue and the altar do not exist but rather that they cannot be approached (οὔτ' ἐπὶ … ἐλθεῖν … ἔστιν). Pausanias (2. 4. 6)

---

50 E.g., Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, p. 8.

51 Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes*, pp. 167–170.

52 Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 328; Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women*, pp. 200–201. Cf. S. *El.* 637–659, where Clytemnestra addresses an image of Apollo Agyieus. See Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides*, p. 34, on the role of the statue of Apollo Agyieus on stage in E.'s *El.* and elsewhere.

53 According to James Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon* (Cambridge, Eng., 1970), p. 160.

reports that there was a sanctuary of Necessity and Force on the slopes of Acrocorinth, as Hadley points out, but that "it was not customary to enter" the premises; no statue or altar is mentioned, but likely one or both existed.[54] Perhaps typical of shrines to Necessity, the custom could be a way of physically corroborating that this goddess cannot be supplicated, an accession to the harsh realization that in life ἀνάγκη cannot be foiled: At *Alc.* 985 the chorus submit that the grip of Necessity cannot be broken: καί σ᾽ ἐν ἀφύκτοισι χερῶν εἷλε θεὰ δεσμοῖς ("Also you has the goddess seized in the bonds of her hands from which there is no escape").

Εἰνοδία, "the goddess of the cross-roads," actually an epithet of divinities such as Hecate, Kore/Persephone, and Artemis and who in this guise is often represented by an image erected at the sides of roads or at crossroads, appears at *Ion* 1048, *Ph.* 109–110, and *Hel.* 570.[55] In addition the fact that Kore/Persephone is called at *Ion* 1085 "golden-crowned," an epithet otherwise unattested for this goddess, as Lee has noted, might indicate that a crowned *statue* of Kore is the referent, a proposition that would seem to draw support from the invocation to Kore as Εἰνοδία, who would typically be represented by a statue, at *Ion* 1048.[56] The immediate inspiration for such imagery? Euripides' contemporary, the Pheidian pupil, Alcamenes, is said by Pausanias (2. 30. 2) to have been the first to make a three-sided image of Hecate (ἀγάλματα Ἑκάτης τρία … προσεχόμενα ἀλλήλοις), an appropriate form for a goddess of the crossroads, who would need to be alert to all directions; these *agalmata* (the plural is justified in this case) stood, according to Pausanias, beside the Nike temple on the acropolis. In the end, however, it is less important whether or not specific shrines with statues of Εἰνοδία or any other of these minor, but fundamental, divinities can be documented in the locales in which Euripides places them. Rather than evidence for an interest in archaeological accu-

---

54 W.S. Hadley, *Euripides. The Alcestis* (Cambridge, Eng., 1953), p. 126, does not make the connection that I make and assumes that the passage indicates that there was no image or altar; it does not necessarily do so.

55 Paley² 2, p. 77; Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 138; Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 275, all on *Ion* 1048; cf. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, pp. 183–184, on *Ph.* 109–110; Richard Kannicht, *Euripides Helena*, 2 (Heidelberg, 1969), pp. 160–161, on *Hel.* 570. On the significance of images of Hecate and others at crossroads, see Sarah Iles Johnston, *Restless Dead. Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1999), pp. 60–61 and 208–211.

56 Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 277, appears puzzled by the epithet, although he does associate Εἰνοδία at 1048 with both Hecate and Kore/Persephone and notes that her image stood at crossroads.

racy, such passages which acknowledge that statues functioned in these many capacities in real life further attest to the playwright's deft touch with the realistic detail.

A monument of some sort to Zeus Tropaios is set up as a trophy of military victory at *Ph.* 572, 1250–1251, 1473, *Supp.* 647, and *Heracl.* 786, 936–937, though we need not necessarily imagine a figural image in every case. There is some difference of opinion over whether an actual statue is indicated by these references.[57] In normal practice a battlefield trophy consisted of an assemblage of captured military paraphernalia mounted on a wooden cross; however, as this is tragedy, something exceptional could pertain. The language used to refer to these objects varies. Sometimes βρέτας appears (*Ph.* 1250–1251, 1473; *Heracl.* 936–937), which connotes an image. The name of the god may or may not appear; since Zeus is the patron of won battles and τροπαῖος a common epithet (e.g., *El.* 671, *Heracl.* 867), the mere presence of "trophy" suffices to convey that the honoree is Zeus. When, however, the word for "trophy" is augmented with ἱδρύω, as at *Heracl.* 786, there is a strong indication of a statue (see below). The addition of βρέτας suggests that Euripides seeks to describe the typical battlefield trophy in loftier terms. In a discussion of these temporary assemblages, Michael M. Sage points to their potential magical powers, as they embody "the manifestation of the divine will of god in battles at the decisive moment," and represent "a symbolic way of returning to the god what he has delivered over, that is, the enemy."[58] Such ideas may lie behind Euripides' choice of language.

By now it should be clear that Euripides does not invariably incorporate a word for statue in every instance where a statue is indicated; often, he takes the oblique route through technical terminology alone. Such is the case with ἵδρυμα ('foundation'), along with the verbal form ἱδρύω ('set up, found'), terms whose specialized technical application to statues is confirmed by parallels in inscriptions.[59] The verb is used in an unremarkable way of the re-erection at Athens of the statue of Artemis at *IT*

---

[57] William Allan, *Euripides. The Children of Heracles* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 2001), pp. 194, 207, cautions against seeing a statue rather than a "regular victory-trophy" at *Heracl.* 786–787, 936–937; Kovacs, *Euripides*, 3, p. 77, n. 20, appears to suggest something similar in reference to *Supp.* 647; Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 277, however, has: "a wooden statue of Zeus, set up in gratitude for victory."

[58] Michael M. Sage, *Warfare in Ancient Greece. A Sourcebook* (London and New York, 1996), p. 101.

[59] The term is not used exclusively of the erection of statues in inscriptions, but cf., e.g., its use on an inscribed herm of ca. 480–460 BC (*CEG* #313).

1453. So also at *Hipp.* 32–33 a statue of Aphrodite is to be set up (ἱδρῦσθαι) in a sanctuary on the Athenian acropolis that is to be named thereafter "[Ἀφ.] ἐφ' Ἱππολύτῳ."[60] Hippolytus himself at *Hipp.* 639 exploits the same verb's metaphorical potential in order to solidify the objectification of women in his long tirade against them, describing a certain kind of wife as "set up like a statue" (ἵδρυται) in the *oikos*. The verb's appearance at *HF* 49 is more complicated. Amphitryon has taken refuge with the wife and children of Heracles at the shrine of Zeus Herkeios. That monument is further characterized as having been "established [by Heracles] as an *agalma* of his spear which brings fair victory" (καλλινίκου δορὸς ἄγαλμα ἱδρύσατο). Both Wilamowitz-Moehlendorff and Bond believe that ἄγαλμα here refers to the fact that the dedication is a "delight" to the god, in the archaic sense of the term, rather than to a literal statue, in the modern (i.e., later fifth century) sense; neither, however, comments on ἱδρύσατο.[61] However, the appearance of the verb ἱδρῦσθαι in immediate juxtaposition with ἄγαλμα strongly suggests that some sort of allusion to a statue is indicated.[62]

Something similar may be the case when, in an address to Zeus at *Supp.* 632–633, the chorus of suppliant women characterize the unburied Argive dead by way of a double metaphor: τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἵδρυμα / πόλεος ἐκκόμιζέ μοι / πρὸς πυρὰν ὑβρισθέν ("your *agalma*, your city foundation, having been outraged [by the Thebans], convey to me for burial"). The tone of the passage makes clear that Zeus himself has also been outraged by the course of events. At any rate, τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἵδρυμα is a curious pairing, and has generated a great deal of commentary. Collard considers the phraseology "a remarkable combination of anaphora, metonymy . . . , enallage . . . and metrical equivalence of asyndetic units emphasized by rhyme." While he does not say so directly, Collard implies that he too takes the phrase to refer to Zeus as well as to the Argive dead, when he notes that the Thebans "thus insult Zeus himself, τὸ σὸν . . . ὑβρισθέν," comparing *Supp.* 511–512.[63] What Collard and

[60] Cf. Paley ^{2} 1. p. 170, and Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 161, both of whom conclude that ἱδρῦσθαι refers to the erection of the goddess's statue. Barrett, op. cit., pp. 160 and 5, n. 3, points to two inscriptions from the 420s that appear to refer to this sanctuary, *IG* I^2 324. 69 (= *IG* I^3 369. 66) and *IG* I^2 310. 280 (= *IG* I^3 383. 233–234).

[61] Wilamowitz-Moehllendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 16–17; Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 74.

[62] Cf. Paley^2 3, p. 12: "ὃν refers perhaps to Διὸς., sc. Διὸς βρέτας."

[63] Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 272.

other commentators miss, however, is the real target of τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἵδρυμα: We are to think of an *image* of Zeus, even as we imagine the addressee himself.[64]

For those who would insist, with Paley, on ignoring the obvious connotations of ἄγαλμα,[65] then the illustrious dead are appropriately the "delight" of Zeus and the "foundation" of the city, and the image need not refer to Zeus at all. However, the doubled image clearly indicates that a real statue as much as an abstract entity has been "outraged" on the god's behalf. The strategic positioning of ἵδρυμα, (anaphora, to Collard), a word with the capacity to remind the listener that foundations must be laid for the bases of statues or they cannot be erected (cf. the unexceptional ways in which Euripides employs the term in the first mentioned instances), points unequivocally to a real statue; thus, "synecdoche" is to be added to the list of rhetorical devices mentioned by Collard in connection with the passage. To reiterate: On its own ἵδρυμα does not necessarily indicate statue; however, its placement in close proximity with ἄγαλμα serves as a semantic indicator that the ἄγαλμα which it serves in apposition must be interpreted as "statue," whether literally, metaphorically, or both. The meaning of each term is shaded by the presence of the other. Moreover, even if the notion of a statue of Zeus is rejected, it makes sense for Euripides to reinforce the concrete as opposed to the abstract coloration of ἄγαλμα, which, by any reading, is intended as a metaphor for the greatness of the Seven, by following it with a term which has an explicit technical association with statuary, in this case, with the mechanics of erection. Either way, the image succeeds on an impressive number of levels, exactly as Collard deduced.

We turn now to the highest categories of statuary in ancient Greek cult and life, which also make their fair share of appearances in the plays of Euripides. The ancient image of Artemis in *IT* discussed above is only one of the more prominent examples. Athens, like most Greek cities, had its own representative of this most sacred of statuary genres, the ancient

---

[64] Cf. the comments of R. Renehan, "Review Article: *Curae Callimacheae*," *Classical Philology* 82 (1987), 240–254 (241), in regard to τᾶς Παλλάδος at Call. *Hymn* 5. 1: "In Greek the unconscious identification of statue and deity is strikingly illustrated by the tendency in that language to make the deity, rather than the statue, the grammatical object of verbs meaning 'set up and dedicate.'" The examples provided include Ar. *Pl.* 1153, where ἱδρύω is the verb.

[65] Paley[2] 1, p. 435, who adopts the ms. ἐκκομίζομαι instead of Musgrave's conjecture, ἐκκόμιζέ μοι, which is preferred by most editors, whom I follow.

image of Athena Polias housed in some structure on the acropolis, which was the beneficiary of honors at both the Great Panathenaia, held every four years, and the annual festival of the same name.[66] We might expect a higher level of attentiveness to archaeological specificity by the playwright when he is referencing familiar local monuments in front of a hometown audience, especially concerning the acropolis, which literally towered above the proceedings, but this is not necessarily the case. Even when he alludes to the landmarks of his native city, Euripides is no archaeologist (why indeed should he be?). Curiously, when very famous monuments are potentially at stake, he seems to prefer the oblique approach to the direct. In most instances the famous monument has to be inferred.

Case in point: While the Polias is arguably one of the intended recipients of a lyric address by the chorus of Marathonian elders at *Heracl.* 748–783, there is no explicit clue that this is the case. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, deleting the τ' of *Heracl.* 754, associates the θρόνον ἀρχέταν of v. 753 with the throne of Erechtheus "siquidem solium Erechthei in ipso Poliadis templo" (He probably means the *altar* of Poseidon and Erechtheus which Paus. 1. 26. 5 describes as being just inside the building that he calls the Erechtheum), while John Wilkins, citing parallels, concludes that Zeus' throne in heaven is meant; Günther Zuntz also argues against Wilamowitz' contention that the Erechtheum is the referent.[67] It is possible that there is hendiadys in οὐρανῷ / καὶ παρὰ θρόνον ἀρχέταν which might better be translated "beside the throne [of Zeus] *in* heaven and in [the temple] of Athena." If this were the case, then the destinations for the song would be two—(1) Zeus' throne in heaven and (2) a temple of Athena in Athens—instead of the three proposed by Zuntz, followed by Wilkins: (1) *in* Heaven, (2) *by* the ruler-throne [of Zeus Basileus] and (3) *in* the house of Athena[68]—although, ultimately, the distinctions between the two suggestions are not substantial. At any rate Zeus' throne in heaven

[66] On the Panathenaia see two recent collections of essays edited by Jenifer Neils, *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Hanover, NH, 1992), which includes B.S. Ridgway, "Images of Athena on the Akropolis," pp. 119–142 (esp. pp. 120–127, with fig. 75, illustrating the seven acropolis sites associated with statues of Athena); and *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaia & Parthenon* (Madison, WI, 1996). I discuss allusions to the Panathenaic robe and its iconography in a later chapter.

[67] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Parerga," *Hermes* 14 (1879), 161–186 (181); John Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae* (Oxford, 1993), p. 148; cf. Allan, *The Children of Heracles*, p. 191; Günther Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester, Eng., 1955), pp. 117–119.

[68] Zuntz, *The Political Plays*, p. 119; Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, pp. 147–148.

is the more likely allusion. As tempting as it is to speculate that the expression alludes to a seated statue of Athena, perhaps even the famous one by Endoios mentioned just before the Erechtheum at Paus. 1. 26. 4, the use of ἀρχέταν, more appropriate to Zeus than to Athena, makes this unlikely but not impossible. It is well to recall that, in the Parthenon east frieze, where the gods appear as if relaxing at home on Olympus, Zeus is seated on a throne while the other gods are on stools. He might also have been seated in the east pediment, which depicts the birth of Athena.[69] In this light θρόνον ἀρχέταν could then be regarded as an oblique allusion to the Parthenon.

The chorus' allusion to a temple of Athena in Athens as one destination for their upcoming ode at *Heracl.* 752–754 (ἰαχήσατε δ' οὐρανῷ / καὶ παρὰ θρόνον ἀρχέταν / γλαυκᾶς τ' ἐν Ἀθάνας) is more likely a reference to the old temple of Athena Polias on the acropolis rather than the Erechtheum, which has been suggested.[70] The Erechtheum is generally dated between 421 and 405 BC, including a hiatus in construction; if Euripides' play is to be dated ca. 430, the Erechtheum will not even have been begun.[71] I would argue, however, that preserving the notion of an "archaic" building is more appropriate to the mythological setting than invoking that most avant-garde of modern buildings, the Erechtheum, with its unique, idiosyncratic design. As for the statue, there would be no danger of anachronism, since the primitive olive-wood object was said to have "fallen from heaven" (Paus. 1. 26. 6) and could not be dated with

---

[69] Olga Palagia, "First among Equals: Athena in the East Pediment of the Parthenon," in *The Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome* (Studies in the History of Art) 49, (Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Symposium Papers) 29, ed. Diana Buitron-Oliver (Hanover and London, 1997), pp. 29–49, has argued again for a standing Zeus, with a review of the evidence for both sides of this long-debated issue.

[70] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Parerga," p. 181; A.C. Pearson, *Euripides. The Heraclidae* (Cambridge, Eng., 1907), p. 112. Something like δόμοις must be supplied; cf. Paley[2] 1, 370. The genitive is Schaefer's reading, followed by Diggle; the ms. otherwise yields no sense. Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, p. 148, is noncommittal on the identification of the temple of Athena that is implied by the genitive, although he rejects the argument of Wilamowitz.

[71] That is, unless one follows newer research that suggests an earlier, Periclean date in the 430s for the inauguration of work on the Erechtheum; see Manolis Korres, "Acropole: Travaux de restauration," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 112 (1988), 612: "avant 431"; Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 206. For the traditional dating, see Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens*, pp. 146–147; the standard reference work on the building is Paton, *The Erechtheum*. Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, p. xxiv, reviews the evidence for the date of the play and favors 430 BC, while Pearson, *Euripides. The Heraclidae*, pp. xxx–xxxiii, favors a date between 430–427.

any degree of accuracy, nor was there apparently any interest in doing so; thus, Euripides' decision not to mention the *agalma* directly is harder to account for. I am encouraged in this proposition, however, by the old men's references and allusions to the honors paid to Athena at the Panathenaia, whose rites are associated with the ancient image.[72] Since the chorus are singing at the Temple of Zeus at Marathon, the statue is not literally in front of them; however, as their loud song is intended reach "into [the temple] of Athena" (v. 753) it may be thought of as being directed to the statue housed within the temple which the chorus are imagining. The "Athenian" character of the ode is inarguable.[73] The chorus address Athena as protector (φύλαξ, v. 772) of the city which is one of her functions as Athena Polias; the appellation μάτηρ (v. 771) applied to a goddess who was not a mother would also reflect this role.[74]

The ambiguity of the chorus from *Children of Heracles* ultimately does not permit a definitive association with the Polias. However, a more explicit reference to the ancient image of Athena Polias occurs at *El.* 1254–1257, where Orestes is instructed by the Dioscouri to go to Athens and supplicate the statue in order to suspend the Furies' pursuit, although the mention of an apotropaic gorgoneion on the shield does sound a shade more like Pheidias' Athena Parthenos.[75] The most famous non-official cult image in later fifth-century Athens was of course the Parthenos. The colossal gold and ivory statue which was commissioned from Pheidias for the Parthenon and made with his own hands has never been overlooked as a potential source for imagery in Euripides, and rightly so, since his first, belated victories as a playwright and the creation and dedication of the statue roughly coincide (late 440s and 430s BC).

---

[72] Cf. Paley[2] 1, p. 372; Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, p. 151, neither of which, however, mentions the statue.

[73] Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, pp. 149–151.

[74] For the practice of addressing goddesses who are not mothers as "mother," see Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, p. 150.

[75] J.D. Denniston, *Euripides Electra* (Oxford, 1939), p. 204; cf. A. *Eum.* 79–80, where virtually the same instructions are given. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 346, includes *Rh.* 501–502 in his collection of references to the ancient image, citing the scholiast to Aristides who claims that the statue in the old temple of Athena in Athens was the very one stolen from Troy by Odysseus and Diomedes. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 22, with n. 62, on the other hand, is surely right to distinguish the two, noting that the Trojan Palladion was housed not on the acropolis but in "the law court named after it in the southeastern part of the city, where cases of homicide were heard." I cannot, however, agree with Hurwit, op. cit., p. 329, n. 62, that this statue is the intended referent at *El.* 1254–1257.

The ancient dramatic references to the Athena Parthenos have long been assembled and become commonplace to acknowledge in commentaries; I have little to add regarding the Euripidean examples.[76]

As the most famous and emblematic image of Athena in all of classical antiquity, the statue is never mentioned directly, which would constitute a perhaps too glaring anachronism, but is (arguably) alluded to through synecdoche, the main iconographical features standing in for the whole complex image being the gorgon (*Ion* 210–211, 992–996; frs. 351 and 360. 46 [*Erec.*]; *Rh.* 306–307), the shield and/or the aegis (*Ion* 210–211 and 1580–1581; *Ph.* 1372; fr. 351 [*Erec.*]; *Rh.* 306–307), the spear (*Ion* 9, which has also been associated with the bronze statue of Athena Promachos, also by Pheidias, which resembled the Parthenos[77]) along with, in most instances, some reference to the golden demeanor of the statue.[78] *Ion* 992–996, a curious account of the origin of the aegis with its gorgoneion, might be added to this list of indirect allusions to the Parthenos.[79] The closest to a direct allusion to the Parthenos is *HF* 1002–1006, as Gregory and others have noticed, where we encounter a spear-wielding, martial

---

[76] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 370–375.

[77] As Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, pp. 24–25, with n. 69, notes, and whose reconstruction drawing (fig. 24) demonstrates, the "Promachos" by Pheidias "does not rightly deserve the epithet" by which it is distinguished, at any rate, only once and in a late source. The colossal image was known in its day as the "Bronze Athena," and her demeanor ("She stood at ease rather than charged into action like a true Promakhos," as Hurwit, loc. cit., observes) is not far removed from that of the later Parthenos.

[78] Regarding *Ph.* 1372, although the immediate context is Theban, I would have to disagree with Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 533, that: "There is no useful point in detecting here an extradramatic nod to the image of the Parthenos on the nearby Acropolis;" Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women*, p. 252, on the other hand, detects an allusion to "the image of Athena on the Akropolis at Athens," although she does not specify which she has in mind. On *Ion* 9: Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 374 (Parthenos); Paley[2] 2, p. 10, Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 68, Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 161 (all, Promachos). The association of this passage with the Promachos may be motivated by the claim of Paus. 1. 28. 2 that the point of the spear and the crest of the helmet of the colossal Promachos were visible from a distance to those sailing to Athens; however, that the statue was made of bronze, not gold, would seem to make it a less likely candidate for the τῆς χρυσολόγχου Παλλάδος of *Ion* 9. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 367–369, lists, with some degree of surprise, only two references to the Promachos in drama, both from Aristophanes (*Eq.* 1172–1176 and *Lys.* 748–757). Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 38, with n. 28, suggests that the second "golden gorgon" mentioned in E.'s *Erec.* (fr. 360. 46) instead refers to an independent monument: "perhaps it is a great gorgoneion set up on the south wall of the Acropolis, a precursor of one set up in Hellenistic times [shown in his fig. 223]."

[79] Paley[2] 2, p. 74, Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 135–136, and Lee, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 270–271, all have excellent commentary on these lines and the origins of Athena's aegis but do not associate the passage with the Parthenos.

image of Athena, "like to a statue to look at" (εἰκὼν <δ’> ὥς ὁρᾶν, v. 1002), who hurls a stone at her favorite to keep him from killing his father Amphitryon and inflicting further carnage on his family.[80] To the list of famous Athenian statues of divinities possibly alluded to in Euripides might be added another: The hymn to Aphrodite at *Med.* 835–845, in which the goddess is portrayed as gently drawing water from the Cephisus river of Attica and plaiting her hair with roses, may be indebted to the most famous pre-Knidian representation of the goddess of love, a contemporary statue by Alcamenes, known from a number of ancient sources as the Aphrodite in the Gardens.[81] Euripides was surely aware of such an acclaimed accomplishment by a contemporary. Pausanias' (1. 19. 2) declaration that the statue is "one of a handful of things in Athens most worthy of seeing" is not merely a reflection of the tastes of the periegete's own time, but a commentary on the statue's standing throughout antiquity. While we do not know what this image looked like, it has been associated with a number of later fifth-century sculptures, including the Fréjus Aphrodite type.[82]

Another imagistic trope in Euripides may owe something to the phenomenon of chryselephantine cult statues of the later fifth-century of which the Athena Parthenos was a famous example.[83] I refer to a spate of references to gilded deities and statues of deities, or parts thereof. The statue of Artemis that Hippolytus plaits with a wreath (*Hipp.* 73–

[80] Justina Gregory, *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1997), p. 139, with n. 41, with additional bibliography. I adopt the text of Kovacs, *Euripides*, 3, as Diggle's, I believe, does not do full justice to the image, which is enhanced grammatically by a small emendation <δ’> suggested by D.S. Robertson (reported in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* [1937], 1; cf. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 319). Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 168, on the other hand, assumes that the Promachos is meant, while Bond, loc. cit., has only "the famous one on the Acropolis." As Robertson, loc. cit., is reported as pointing out, images of a spear-brandishing Athena were "extremely common." This is especially true on the acropolis, where a number of small bronze statuettes dating from the Archaic and Early Classical periods have been found (Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 24, with fig. 22). The obverses of Panathenaic amphorae also feature the goddess in this aspect.

[81] For a convenient collection of the sources, see J.J. Pollitt, *The Art of Ancient Greece. Sources and Documents* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990), p. 65. Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 264, draws attention to the "feminine," Sapphic qualities of the entire "ode to Athens" (*Med.* 824–865), while a very unfeminine, child-killing Medea's arrival in the city, according to Rehm, "will shatter this dream."

[82] Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 197; for its scholarly history, see Martin Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (Cambridge, Eng., 1975), pp. 350–351; Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, p. 268.

[83] See now the monograph by Kenneth D.S. Lapatin, *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford, 2001).

87) has gilded hair (χρυσέας κόμης). Artemis herself is addressed as "golden haired" (χρυσεοβόστρυχον) by Antigone at *Ph.* 191–192, while she wears a golden diadem (ἄμπυκα) at *Hec.* 465.[84] Kore/Persephone is called "golden-crowned" at *Ion* 1085, which, as we have already seen, is a likely reference to a statue. Eros is χρυσοκόμας at *IA* 548. Mastronarde observes that one of these epithets, χρυσεοβόστρυχος (*Ph.* 191), appears elsewhere only in Philoxenus (*PMG* 821), and that four other χρυσεο-compounds in late Euripidean lyric are *hapax legomena*,[85] which suggests that Euripides was keen to coin language for describing his deities and their images that was capable of emulating the opulence of cult statuary of the day.[86]

Sacred statues are apparently gilded entirely at *Tr.* 1074, where χρυσέων τε ξοάνων τύποι in Troy's temples are missed. At *Ph.* 220–221, when the chorus of maidens from Tyre wish that "just like *agalmata* made of worked gold, I might have become a servant of Phoebus" at Delphi,[87] it is the votive statues put before the deity that are golden, in an image that recalls Hephaistos' animated golden female helpmates at *Il.* 18. 417–418. There is irony and perhaps a little humor in this reversed state of

---

[84] H.L. Lorimer, "Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology," in *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford, 1936), pp. 14–33 (22); Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 337 and 498–499, who compares the gilded hair and golden frontlet of the late archaistic marble Artemis from the House of Marcus Holconius Rufus in Pompeii, now in the National Museum, Naples, which he illustrates in fig. 3 (cf. *LIMC* 2, pt. 2, s. v. Artemis/Diana, pl. 11b). For discussion of images of Artemis with gilded crowns, see *LIMC* 2, pt. 1, s. v. Artemis, p. 620 (Lilly Kahil and Noëlle Icard). χρυσαμπύκων is used of the Muses at Pi. *P.* 3. 89; λιπαράμπυκος, of Mnemosyne at *N.* 7. 15.

[85] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, pp. 205 and 200. This is not to imply that E. is alone in applying χρυσεο- and χρυσο- compounds to the gods and other objects made sacred by association with them; Lorimer, "Gold and Ivory," traces the history of these ideas back to the orient and documents additional examples in early Greek poetry and elsewhere. But among the tragedians, as comes clear from Lorimer's study, which includes a number of citations of E. but none of A. or S., E. appears to have been the most interested in these epithets, although she does not make the observation.

[86] I use the verb "coin" here in a general sense, aware that we cannot know for certain whether these terms are in fact coinages, as Dover, *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*, p. 117, cautions: "Although we may entertain a strong suspicion that a lexeme of unusual type attested just once in the Classical period was coined for the occasion by the author ..., we possess so small a fraction of what once existed, and are so short of information on its chronology, that the mere fact that a lexeme is attested for the first time in such-and-such an author does not in itself tell us that the author coined it."

[87] In translating ἐγενόμαν "might have become" rather than the more literal "became," I follow Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 219, who argues that the chorus of Tyrean girls have not already been to Delphi.

affairs in which the worshipper mimics and replaces a votive statue; in normal circumstances it is the statue's role to mimic the appearance and stand in place of the worshipper. At *Ph.* 281–282 the chorus use analogous language when they describe themselves as "first-fruit of the spear" (δορὸς … ἀκροθίνιον) who have been sent to Phoebus just as if they were statues, vases, or other form of inanimate thank-offering. Euripidean passages like those mentioned have rightly been associated with golden statues of various types that are documented in written sources, such as the colossal, beaten gold *agalma* of Zeus dedicated at Olympia by the Corinthian tyrant, Cypselus, which we know from a number of literary descriptions.[88] From Herodotus we hear of a "golden Alexander" (ὁ Μακεδὼν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χρύσεος, 8. 121. 2) and golden portrait statue of King Croesus' baker-woman (1. 51. 5), both at Delphi. Numerous ancient sources attest to the existence of a solid gold portrait statue of Gorgias of Leontini at Delphi (e.g., Paus 10. 18. 7; Pliny 33. 83; Cic. *de Or.* 3. 32. 129).[89] There are also the golden statues that served as a form of punishment for Athenian Archons who broke their oaths ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* l. 7. 1, 55. 5; Pl., *Phdr.* 235d–e; Plu., *Sol.* 25. 3).[90] More fully documented are the over-life-sized golden Nike held in the hand of the Parthenos, about whose appearance we can be more certain, as it is attested in numerous literary sources, inscriptions, and copies, as well as the large group of golden Nikai figures at comparable scale made for Athena just after the Parthenos and kept on the acropolis from 434 BC until all but one were melted down for coinage in 407/6.[91] There

[88] Incl. Pl. *Phdr.* 236b; Paus. 5. 2. 3; Strabo 8. 3. 30; 8. 6. 20.

[89] For a complete list of sources for this statue, see Rosamond K. Sprague, *The Older Sophists* (Columbia, SC, 1972), pp. 34–35.

[90] For a recent discussion of the Archons' penalty, see Leslie Kurke, *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold. The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton, 1999), pp. 314–316, with n. 43. Further on the prehistory of the taste for colossal golden statuary that manifests itself in later fifth-century Athens, see Dorothy B. Thompson, "The Golden Nikai Reconsidered," *Hesperia* 13 (1944), pp. 173–209 (174), and, for a vast array of examples, Greek and oriental, and trenchant analysis of the history of the idea of gods as "gilded," east and west, Lorimer, "Gold and Ivory."

[91] Parthenos' Nike: Leipen, *Athena Parthenos*, pp. 34–36. Golden Nikai: Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon*, pp. 272–275, who conveniently collects the relevant sources and provides a full bibliography; Thompson, "The Golden Nikai," who suggests (pp. 174 and 176) that the Nikai celebrated specific Athenian military victories of the later fifth century. On the melting down of the images, Thompson, op. cit., p. 176; new or restored versions appear in the fourth century and, according to the author (pp. 174 and 176–177), "can be traced in various inscriptions down to the middle of the fourth century BC and by literary references into the third." On the height of these statues (ca. six feet, like the Parthenos' Nike), see Thompson, op. cit., pp. 181 and 183–184.

was evidently a penchant for monumental gold statuary in the fifth century BC that increased as the century progressed, culminating in a virtual mania for golden images that may be reflected in Xanthias' exclamation, "o golden gods" (ὦ χρυσοῖ θεοί), at Aristophanes' *Frogs* 483 in 405 BC. In this company one must not overlook the grand chryselephantine cult statues as a source of inspiration for such passages, as these images represented the most flagrant exploitation of surplus wealth in the form of gold for statuary in the period in question.[92]

The Aesthetics of Statuary

Even more diagnostic of the depth of Euripides' fascination with statues are those sculptural references that anticipate an informed aesthetic response from the audience. Into this category fall some of the most examined of Euripidean images. Two of these images, unlike those already discussed, presume audience acquaintance with monumental female nudity in sculpture, a relatively new phenomenon in the later fifth-century. The famous Niobid statuary group, which has already been introduced in connection with the similes in *Andromache*. might also be associated with these images. One of the preserved members of the group, the so-called "Stumbling Niobid" in the Terme Museum, Rome, exhibits nudity; there might have been others. This statue, likely an original of ca. 430 BC, along with such scantily clad figures such as the Nike of Paionios, the "Fréjus Aphrodite" type, and the Nereids of the Nereid Monument, mentioned above, are among the handful of monumental "nude" (a term I use loosely, as no one of these images is fully nude, but rather nominally clothed or only semi-nude) female statues known to Euripides and his audience.[93] With clinging chitons slipping from their

---

[92] Cf. Lorimer, "Gold and Ivory," who associates the earliest, post-Homeric surge of literary interest in this kind of imagery with, simply, "the cult statue."

[93] "Stumbling Niobid" (Rome, Terme 72274): Ridgway, *Fifth Century Styles*, fig. 25; for the others, see note 17, above. The series of Classical Amazons by the most famous sculptors of the day including Pheidias (Boardman, *GSC*, figs. 190–195) have one breast exposed, but not for erotic purposes, so they are not considered "nude" here. There is sporadic female nudity in smaller-scale relief work, such as the frieze of the Temple of Apollo at Bassai (of disputed date, possibly post-400), and on vases and in other minor art forms. For a recent overview and interpretation of pre-Knidian female nudity or partial nudity, see Beth Cohen, "Divesting the Female Breast of Clothes in Classical Sculpture," in *Naked Truths. Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*, Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons, eds. (New York and London, 1997), pp. 66–92.

shoulders, exposing one or both breasts and sometimes more, these renderings are unquestionably eroticized, if not completely naked. Even partial female nudity, on the monumental scale, is a novelty at this date; the full nudity of Praxiteles' Knidian Aphrodite, which shocked viewers in the mid-fourth century BC, the time of its creation, was not yet on the horizon.

Fr. 125 of Euripides' *Andromeda* arguably reflects a new acquaintance with the idea of female nudity in monumental statues. The fragment contains Perseus' first response to the unexpected vision of Andromeda chained to a cliff overlooking the sea: He mistakes her for a statue "naturally formed from the rock" (ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαΐνων τυκισμάτων, v. 3).[94] The scene is famously parodied in a re-enactment in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* (vv. 1105–1124), produced in 411 BC, which includes a lewd exchange between the character Euripides and the Scythian archer during which disparaging comments are traded about the appearance of the genitals of "Andromeda" (σκέψαι τὸ κύστο· μή τι μικτὸν παίνεται;, v. 1114[95]), who is being played in the play-within-a-play by the tragedian's fictional kinsman. For such stage business to be effective, I would argue, requires Aristophanes' "Andromeda" to be nude, and tantalizingly suggests that Euripides' authentic version must have been the same.[96] She is evidently quite comely, but to say this directly would be too blunt. On the other hand comparing someone to a statue is tantamount to acknowledging that he or she is exceptionally beautiful, yet is far more resonant than simply stating the obvious, since the comparison opens up possibil-

[94] Following Kannicht (*TrGF* 5), I prefer the spelling of Jacobs, who conjectured τυκισμάτων, to Maas' sp., τυχ-; the term is discussed further below. Eva C. Keuls, *Painter and Poet in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997), pp. 165–199, with fig. 10, discusses an Apulian dish that juxtaposes scenes from E.'s *Androm.* and A.'s *Niobe*, suggesting that the two plays were thought to have common themes, including a woman being "likened to a statue by an entering character" (p. 195); Keuls also introduces additional archaeological material in an extensive comparison of the plays.

[95] κύστο is an emendation by Scaliger of the σκυτο of the ms.; σῦκο has also been suggested (Sommerstein); it is clearly a reference to female genitalia, which, of course, the kinsman does not possess.

[96] Gibert, in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, p. 141, believes that she is dressed as a bride, and cites (p. 139) as an illustration of the scene in E.'s play the so-called Andromeda crater (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin VI 3237), which shows a chained Andromeda in elaborate Eastern dress and headgear (illustr. Oliver Taplin, *Pots & Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B. C.* [Los Angeles, 2007], fig. 59). Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (1968; 2nd ed., rev. by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis, Oxford, 1988), p. 200, however, disassociates the vase with the play, adding: "The scene as depicted is plainly not one that can have been represented in the theatre." This vase and six others that have been associated with E.'s *Androm.* are

ities for additional discretional imagery. The reader/listener is invited to customize the image, so to speak, by envisioning an ideal statue of his or her own choosing. Furthermore, since the role of a nude female would have been played by a dressed male in the original performance, imagining a statue was not only a prerequisite, but the only way for the scene to work—a clever way to get around the limitations of the conventions of the ancient stage.

The second passage, one of the most admired in tragedy, more directly confronts female nudity in art. At *Hec.* 560–561, Polyxena, about to be sacrificed, rents her garment down to the low waist, exposing her breasts to the assembled crowd; her lovely torso is compared to that of a statue (μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος / κάλλιστα). The girl then falls to the ground on one knee (καὶ καθεῖσα πρὸς γαῖαν γόνυ, v. 561). This exquisite image, which Collard has called "the earliest comparison with statuary in Tragedy [*sic*]," has long impressed and fascinated students of Greek drama.[97] Referring to this passage Georgia Xanthakis-Karamanos has observed: "While similes from painting occur in Aeschylus also …, sculpture is not recorded to have affected the sensitivity of tragic poets before Euripides."[98] Aside from the question of its innovative status, which has not, to my knowledge, been challenged, the precise purpose of Euripides' comparison, its effect on the reader/listener/viewer, and whether or not the image is meant to be erotic, among other things, have occasioned debate.

Judith Mossman, who takes into account modern art historical scholarship on fifth-century Greek female nudity, concludes that pathos is the primary intended effect of invoking a statue, rather than eroticism.[99] Pucci, on the other hand, sees the *agalma* at *Hec.* 560–561 as a reference to a statue that is "generally offered to the gods and which represents them," whereby the "poor body of Polyxena is replaced by an image that evokes already restitution, honour and immortality" as well as a "sign of death",

---

discussed in Taplin, op. cit., pp. 174–184. All show a clothed Andromeda. However, as Taplin, op. cit., p. 175, points out, only the Andromeda crater post-dates E.'s play. Moreover, attempts to cite these vases as evidence for the scene in E.'s *Androm.* are further complicated by the existence of a lost play of the same name by S., about which little is known (cf. Taplin, loc. cit.). In the end Taplin is unable to associate any example unequivocally with E.'s play.

[97] Christopher Collard, *Euripides Hecuba* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1991), p. 160.

[98] Georgia Xanthakis-Karamanos, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy* (Athens, 1980), p. 82, who discusses *Hec.* 558–561 in connection with Chaeremon's *Alphesiboea* 5–6.

[99] Judith Mossman, *Wild Justice. A Study of Euripides' Hecuba* (Oxford, 1995), p. 159, with n. 45.

since "nothing can efface the absence of life (from the effigy)."[100] Scodel has argued that the invocation of a statue at this point is meant to equate Polyxena with a luxurious possession and to contrast the excessive display of her virginal body with that of statues which are appropriately exposed to view; as many do, she compares the imagery of the sacrifice of Iphigenia in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 242, the likely source of inspiration for the later poet, where Iphigenia's nudity is likened to paintings (πρέπουσα θ᾽ ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς).[101] Adopting a feminist approach, Rabinowitz suspects that Euripides "has Polyxena turn herself into a spectacle for the internal audience, perhaps in recognition that her only power lies in her exchange value, that is, in making herself desirable. ... He not only has her stress her role as object of the male gaze but underlines it by having Talthybios use the image of the statue."[102]

While all of these views have validity, I am most sympathetic with the last, since it would be mistaken, I believe, as discomfiting as it is, to diminish the erotic overtones of the scene, more especially if one follows Euripides' injunction and actually envisions a contemporary statue. The perceived unseemliness of the playwright's invoking the possibility of male arousal on so tragic an occasion has, perhaps, inspired some to look elsewhere for his primary motivation. Her nubile beauty, however, is the point. Of the analogy with the passage from *Agamemnon*, Paley, who assumes the *agalma* at *Hec.* 560–561 to be a statue, makes the interesting observation that in Aeschylus the comparison with paintings "refers to the *silence* [rather] than to the *beauty* of Iphigenia at the altar."[103] Paley is clearly alluding to the notion that, of the two figural arts, painting is the one "condemned to silence" (Pl. *Phdr.* 275d), while statues may indeed "speak," given the proper circumstances, in antiquity, and consequently are more often spoken of as lifelike. Kurtz, in a comparative analysis of the two often linked tragic passages, points out that the analogy with idealized classical statuary allows Euripides to capture not only Polyxena's

---

[100] Pucci, "The Monument and the Sacrifice," p. 158.

[101] Scodel, "Virgin Sacrifice," pp. 121–126; in the latter case, however, it seems that the chorus turn away at the actual moment of sacrifice (*Ag.* 247), whereas in the case of E.'s Polyxena, they watch it.

[102] Rabinowitz, *Anxiety Veiled*, p. 60, who, in n. 69, points to further ramifications of the scene: "Since the actor was male, the heterosexual erotic that I refer to could exist only in the imagination; the homoerotic potential of the scene remains hidden under her robe, but perhaps it is significant that this fetishistic desire for Polyxena is aroused only when 'she' seems to act like a male hero."

[103] Paley^2 2, p. 550.

beauty but also her καλοκἀγαθία.[104] The author does not elaborate; however, the supposition is that male statues of the Classical period embodied this ideal state. Both of these suggestions assume that the formula statue = beauty lies behind the Euripidean image.

Beyond noting the apparent incongruity imposed by the dearth of female nudity in contemporary art, attempts to suggest potential sources for the simile at *Hec.* 560–561 have been surprisingly scarce.[105] True, full female nudity in monumental statuary from the later fifth century is virtually non-existent, but some useful parallels do present themselves. The "Stumbling Niobid" from the Terme, as it is, offers a perfect prototype. For those who know the statue and the scene in *Hecuba*, it is hard to avoid the presumption, which cannot be proven, that the playwright had before his mind's eye this very image of a dying young Niobid, shot from behind, her breasts exposed by her cascading garment, dropping to one knee, as he wrote the lines. If the play dates to the mid-to-late 420s, as has been suggested,[106] the figure or its type, which are thought to date from ca. 430, could in theory have been familiar to Euripides and his audience. The unusual state of two-thirds undress—her genitals are concealed, but on her left side, the nudity extends in one unbroken line from the shoulder to the ankle, with the exception of a strand of garment lying over her calf—is unique to later fifth-century sculpture.

In the same manner as the dying Niobid by the anonymous fifth-century sculptor, Euripides' Polyxena, even as she dies, manages to fall decorously (εὐσχήμων, *Hec.* 569), a final gesture that Kurtz considers evidence of her καλοκἀγαθία.[107] In part at least the term refers to the modesty that she manages to preserve (κρύπτουσ᾽ ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ᾽ ἀρσένων χρεών, in the next line).[108] Scodel, who has written most extensively on the simile, does not discuss the art historical evidence for the period. However, her claim that "exposure of the female genitals would not be beautiful, but ugly and ridiculous"[109] appears also to be true of contemporary statuary, where overt representation is notably avoided and would continue to be, even when full nudity was broached;

[104] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 416.

[105] E.g., Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, p. 160; Paley^2 2, p. 550, perhaps a little too confidently observes that "Greek female statues were often draped from the waist downwards, and left nude above."

[106] Collard. *Euripides Hecuba*, pp. 34–35.

[107] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 416, n. 105.

[108] Cf. Paley^2 2, p. 551.

[109] Scodel, "Virgin Sacrifice," p. 122.

on this point the standard of realism set in male statues makes an instructive comparison. However, εὐσχήμων could also allude to the fall of Polyxena's dress, which, it might be imagined, somehow stops short of her genital area (Euripides' specifying that it reached her navel might be a way of indicating this delicately), but nonetheless permits the revelation of the beauties of her left flank, and disposes itself in a decorative, as well as decorous, fashion; the Niobid statue shows how this arrangement may be made to seem totally fortuitous. On the other hand, since the idea of comparing Polyxena to a statue had already been introduced, it may be picked up again with εὐσχήμων: She could also fall like a statue. Other roughly contemporary sculptures that come to mind include the numerous fallen Amazons in relief, especially the many variations on a graceful and noble fall that could be found among the vanquished Amazons, most with breast exposed, on the exterior of the shield of the Athena Parthenos, a monument familiar to the first audience of *Hecuba*.[110] Then again, while the *agalma* at *Hec.* 560–561 is usually assumed to refer to a sculpture, and I myself favor that interpretation, it is not out of the question that a two-dimensional work of art is the referent. To round out our analysis of this famous image, which is strong enough to sustain such variant interpretations, we will consider potential painterly sources in the next chapter.

If it appears to have been the inspiration for the bold imagery of *Hec.* 560–561 and fr. 125 (*Andromeda*), nudity, however, remains the exception in monumental female statuary of the fifth century. Female beauty was conveyed more typically through graceful carriage and seductive pose, alone. As models, there were the Charites, with little else to do in Greek mythology but personify beauty and grace in women. In Euripides they are mentioned on two memorable occasions, at *HF* 673–675 (οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας / ταῖς Μούσαισιν συγκαταμειγνύς, ἡδίσταν συζυγίαν, "I will not cease from interlocking the Charites together with the Muses, the sweetest of yokings") and again at *Hipp.* 1148 (συζύγιαι Χάριτες), linked or yoked in dance, as it happens, just as they were depicted in contemporary art, including, as is likely, the east frieze of the

---

[110] As reconstructed by Leipen, *Athena Parthenos*, figs. 81–82, with figs. 23–36, the extant copies of the individual figures and groups upon which the reconstruction is based. The newly published Polyxena sacrcophagus from Gümüsçay, Turkey, which has been assigned to the late sixth century BC (Nurten Sevinç, "A New Sarcophagus of Polyxena from the Salvage Excavations at Gümüsçay," *Studia Troica* 6 [1996], 251–264), shows the moment of sacrifice but without the nudity, although her garment is revealing; the typology thus does not figure among possible models for E.'s scene.

temple of Athena Nike.[111] Pausanias, who speaks of the Charites at length, reports on two occasions (1. 22. 8; 9. 35. 7) of a statue group by none other than Socrates that stood at the entrance to the acropolis, where there apparently was a cult; some of the "Neo-attic" reliefs (so-called because they appear to copy late-fifth century works) of three dancing, intertwined Charites or Horai are thought to reflect this group, whoever its actual author. There was also a cult of the Charites in the NW section of the agora.[112] The Hellenistic version of the "Three Graces," nude, linked, and interwoven, with their identical physical attributes on full display, would go forward as a favorite subject in western art.[113]

The Charites are not fully characterized presences in Greek literature. Their birth to Eurynome, daughter of Ocean, and Zeus, is recorded by Hesiod (*Th.* 906–911), where their beauty and the eroticism of their glance are singled out. They put in a few appearances in Homer (e.g., *Il.* 5. 338, 14. 267 and 275; *Od.* 8. 364–366), in the Homeric Hymns (*h. Aph.* 61–62), and in Pindar (*O.* 2. 49–52), where they do not, however, dance nor are yoked together. They dance at *Od.* 18. 194 and *h. Hom.* 27. 15, are indirectly associated with dance at Hes. *Th.* 63–64, and oversee the dance at Pi. *O.* 14. 8–17, but are not linked or yoked. In the *HF* passage the tautology of συγκαταμειγνύς and συζυγίαν ensures that there can be no avoiding the visualization of interwoven human figures. Euripides' distinctive image does not as it seems depend on poetic sources, leaving open the possibility that he was inspired by works of art.[114] The coincidence of the imagery is too neat to explain otherwise.

Clothed female sensuality in art is highlighted in another play, in improbable circumstances. While a real *agalma*, and a notably sacred one, is the central focus of *IT*, *agalmata* of a rather more secular-sounding nature are invoked in an ingenious, and consequently much-discussed genre vignette as the play's action gets underway. In its retelling by the herdsman at *IT* 273–274, we hear that Orestes and Pylades, having waded

---

[111] *LIMC* 3, pt. 1, s. v. Charis, Charites, p. 196 (Evelyn B. Harrison); 3, pt. 2, s. v., pls. 22, 23, and 25.

[112] R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, 3: *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* (Princeton, 1957), pp. 59–61.

[113] Pausanias (9. 35. 6–7) makes special note of the change in manner of depiction from clothed to nude, and speculates about when this transition might have occurred. It appears to have been a Hellenistic invention; as Evelyn B. Harrison, *LIMC* 3, pt. 1, s. v. Charis, Charites, p. 200, observes: "There is an Alexandrian sensibility behind it."

[114] Cf. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 239; Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 377; Hadley, *The Hippolytus*, p. 112, ad loc. v. 1147, who also notes that "συζύγιος as an adj. is found only here."

ashore at the end of their journey to Taurus, take shelter in a cave, where they are spotted by the locals who mistake them for a protracted list of sundry divinities and demigods that finishes with a great flourish with "*agalmata* of Nereus" (Νηρέως ἀγάλμαθ'), the old man of the sea whose fifty daughters are alluded to in the same gesture as a "noble chorus" (τὸν εὐγενῆ / … χορόν). Iphigenia at vv. 216–217 had already reminded the audience of the importance in her story of one of these Nereids, Thetis, whose son, Achilles, was promised her as a husband at the start of the Trojan expedition in order to lure her to the site. At vv. 273–274 a generic "agalmata," which immediately triggers the unmarked visual response, "statue," is juxtaposed with a verbal description of dancing Nereids, engendering a secondary, this time marked, visual response. The unavoidable merging of the two semantic units into one results in a single image: men being compared to statues of Nereids. In this reading "Nereus" is there only to put a name to the female members of the "chorus" who are the actual target of the comparison. That much would seem obvious.

The expression Νηρέως ἀγάλμαθ', however, has stymied editors and commentators, who, ignoring the most common connotation of *agalma* as statue, and evidently not willing to seek a paratextual frame of reference, are bothered by the idea of men being compared directly, as its seems, to women. The most recent commentator on *IT*, Kyriakou, concludes: "If no textual problem is postulated, then this reference must count as an otherwise unattested piece of Greek lore."[115] A desperate-sounding Platnauer, followed by some translators, suggests that the use of *agalmata* is an endearing way to refer to otherwise unattested sons or grandsons of Nereus for whom the two young men are mistaken, but others have concluded somewhat reluctantly that the two are, in fact, taken for Nereids, in one case, explaining that the herdsmen have lost their senses on account of fright![116] Kyriakou, for her part, is having none of

115 Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 117.

116 Platnauer, *Euripides Iphigenia*, pp. 83–84; Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia*, p. 193; England, *Iphigeneia Among the Tauri*, p. 149, who attributes the last observation to Wecklein (a source I was unable to identify further). Paley[2] 3, p. 364, assumes that two of the Nereid nymphs are meant, but seems not to be bothered by it. England, loc. cit., summarizes the "remarkable difference of opinion [that] has shown itself in the interpretation of these words [i.e., Νηρέως ἀγάλμαθ']." Platnauer, op. cit., p. 84, points out that Schenkl (a reference I was not able to identify) "arbitrarily" removed these two lines altogether, apparently so puzzled by them. W. Bynner's translation in David Grene and Richmond Lattimore, eds., *The Complete Greek Tragedies*, 3 (Chicago, IL, 1959), p. 354, has "broth-

this, observing that "there is no indication for such a strange assumption in the text."[117] The latter interpretation, that the two are taken for Nereids, in spite of its obvious incongruities, still seems the most likely, but not for the reasons usually offered. At this date the term *agalma* always connotes "statue" in addition to any residual adjectival force of "delightful" that might still pertain.[118] There is no need to postulate undocumented "sons" or "grandsons" of Nereus as the intended referent for *agalmata*: It is Orestes and Pylades themselves who are being likened in their present demeanors not to women but to *statues* of women.

This makes perfect sense. Males in ancient Greece are beautiful as statues and make for beautiful statues to a degree unmatched even by young, nubile females. In *IT* two men in the prime of life, handsome and robust, have just waded ashore from the sea with the result that their wet, see-through linen garments cling tightly to their naked bodies—an impressive sight, to be sure, any time or place. It is thus less than shocking that the Greeks' twinned appearances put the middle-aged herdsmen who accidentally encounter them in mind of statues. True, women are more often associated with diaphanous drapery (cf. τὰ διαφανῆ χιτώνια at Ar. *Lys.* 48); however, Sophocles, in *Women of Trachis* 767–769, pointedly compares the poisoned cloth that adheres to Heracles' body to the work of a craftsman,[119] suggesting that male statues, too, could be associated with the trope. Then again, the fact that the men are dressed rather than nude lends itself better to comparison with female than with male statues, which are typically nude. The image of beautiful young men in clinging, transparent chitons intertwined with that of dancing sea Nymphs opens up the possibility that the use of the term *agalmata* in the present context is intended to evoke a visual memory of some well-known statues of Nereids or Nymphs, which as it happens are

---

ers" and "sons," while Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4, p. 179, offers "darling boys of Nereus." Ruth Scodel, "Δόμων ἄγαλμα: Virgin Sacrifice and Aesthetic Object," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126 (1996), 111–128 (114–115), is good on the use of *agalma* of a person to mean something like "ornament."

[117] Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 117.

[118] Cf. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, pp. 103–106, who, in an overview of the term, singles out E.'s uses of ἄγαλμα as evidence for its having transitioned from "Kultbild" to "Weihgeschenk," and, by the late fifth century, into simply another word for "statue" (op. cit., p. 105).

[119] Thus, the simile ὥστε τέκτονος/χιτών at S. *Tr.* 768–769 has been interpreted (Davies, *Sophocles Trachiniae*, p. 189; Gilbert A. Davies, *The Trachiniae of Sophocles with a Commentary Abridged from the Larger Edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb, Litt.D.* [Cambridge, Eng., 1908], p. 136).

universally represented in later Classical art with clinging wet drapery, or, if not specific statues, some statuary type or sculptural style.

We do not have far to look for contemporary paradigms. Since most post-Parthenon representations of females, including those who do not live in the water, are shown with tightly clinging, often transparent drapery, there are plenty of options beginning with the Parthenon itself. Drapery of the so-called Rich Style is used to mold and reveal the nominally concealed feminine body as well as to create a sensation of actual motion, often of a frenzied nature.[120] Now just as the Scythian herdsmen gather the courage to approach the strangers, Orestes has a mad scene which unnerves the simple men. The revelation of Orestes' fragile mental state brings to mind contemporary sculpted representations of raving maenads, their bodies visibly pulsating underneath their drapery. The ideal comparandum, the lost Laconian Dancers of Kallimachos thought to be reflected in the extant Dancing-Maenad reliefs, has already been discussed and associated directly with Euripides in the previous chapter. However, we need not think exclusively of maenads; any seductively posed, see-through drapery swathed, later fifth-century female figure would do, including the altogether more sedate "Fréjus Aphrodite" type. Known from numerous Roman copies, the type has been associated with a number of lost later fifth-century masterworks, including Alcamenes' Aphrodite in the Gardens, yet its precise identification remains unknown.[121] The Nike temple parapet figures would also be appropriate, while the acroteria from the Hephaisteion and from the contemporary Temple of Ares and Athena at Acharnae, which have been identified as Nereids, both match the subject and exemplify the style.[122]

The most tempting of monuments to associate with this passage, the so-called Nereid monument of Xanthos in Lycia, with its sixteen figures of Nereids displaying all manner of variations on the clinging-drapery theme, is apparently too late for Euripides,[123] but any number

120 Webster, *Greek Art and Literature*, pp. 189–197, directly compares the Rich style and features of Euripidean poetry.

121 Dancing-Maenad reliefs: Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 243; Fréjus Aphrodite, see note 82, above.

122 Respectively, Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 130, pp. 146 and 170, with figs. 116 and 119. Additional examples of the clinging drapery style for women from the later fifth century include the Nike of Paionios from Olympia, Boardman, op. cit., fig. 139; and votive reliefs, e.g., Boardman, op. cit., figs. 175–176, which often include nymphs.

123 For the date, see Childs, *The City-Reliefs of Lycia*, p. 13 (ca. 380); cf. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, p. 171 (ca. 390); Lucilla Burn, *The British Museum Book of Greek and Roman Art* (London, 1991), pp. 117–119, with fig. 100 (ca. 400).

of other, more contemporary generic images of dancing girls, maenads, and flamboyant Nikai might have inspired the idea of associating clothed men recently emergent from the sea with statues of dancing, frenetic women prevalent in later fifth-century sculpture. The sterns of the fifty ships of Achilles' Myrmidons decorated, fittingly, with χρυσέαις εἰκόσιν ("golden icons") of the fifty Nereids in the "catalog of ships" at *IA* 239–241 may owe to comparable prototypes, whether or not the passage was written by Euripides.[124] But if the listener or reader of *IT* is resolute in seeking a male counterpart to the "wet-look" style favored for draped female images of the later fifth-century in order to envision the sensual impression conveyed by two draped males fresh from a dip in the ocean, we now have the Motya Youth, which, though its date continues to be controversial, makes for a fine paradigm; its covert homoeroticism may be noted.[125] Of course if the men in *IT* are nude, as was a sea-borne Odysseus in the Nausicaa episode of the *Odyssey*, the suggestion that they resemble such statues would have to be abandoned, but I see no indication in the text that they are not dressed, and furthermore, unlike the situation in *Od.* 6, there seems be no attendant condition for overt erotic overtones in this one. Whatever eroticism the scene possesses is left to the mind (and eye) of the beholder.

Comparing someone to an *agalma* is not always flattering in Euripides, and the very beauty that is the hallmark of Classical statuary is wielded against the targets of these comparisons. The apparent εἰκώ and μίμημα of Helen that greets Teucer as he first sets foot in the land of Proteus at *Hel.* 72–75 might fall into this category; the resemblance is so striking (and no wonder, since it is her very self) that he is ready to kill the unknown woman for simply looking like the beautiful but detested Helen. In a fragment thought to be from *Alexandros*, Cassandra insults Hecuba with the epithet, augmenting its sting by using it in apposition to κύων: Ἑκάτης ἄγαλμα φωσφόρου κύων ἔσῃ ("You will be a dog, an *agalma* of torch-bearing Hecate," fr. 62h). In Hipploytus' tirade against women, the typical wife who is the bane of a man's house is compared unfavorably to an *agalma* (*Hipp.* 631–632). The objectification of women is reiterated

[124] Cf. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 428, who assumes, not without justification, that the catalog of ships in the posthumously produced *IA* is the work of the poet that Kovacs, *Euripides* 6, p. 160, later calls the "Reviser," while allowing for the possibility that the "Pseudo-Euripides" might have had in mind the Nereid Monument.

[125] Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, figs. 297–298. In a recent monograph Carlo O. Pavese, *L'Auriga di Mozia* (Rome, 1996) identifies the youth as a charioteer from a victory monument for Theron in the Olympic Games of 476 BC.

at v. 639, when, in the luckiest of households, in Hippolytus' view, a harmlessly stupid, if useless wife is "set up like a statue" (ἵδρυται) in the *oikos*.[126] The average husband, of course, smitten by the loveliness of his acquisition and desirous of flaunting it among his peers, treats her to fancy clothes. But to this young man's misogynistic eyes decking a woman out in finery is, as the κόσμος, or adornment, of a statue, like adding καλόν to a κακίστῳ; it will not improve her character nor neutralize her negative effect on the house. Cold stone is cold stone, and no manner of accoutering, no matter how opulent, will change its character. Kurtz goes further, taking *agalma* as a reference to a cult statue, and compares the draping with the peplos of the ancient image of Athena at Athens during the Panatheniac procession, an image dripping with misogynistic irony.[127]

However, Euripides is nothing if not even-handed in his cynicism. Men who are strong-bodied but without wits are compared in a not unduly favorable way to *agalmata* in the agora at *El.* 387–388, a likely allusion to ideally beautiful Classical statues of nude male athletes with typically blank-looking facial expressions.[128] So too fr. 282. 10–11 (*Autolykos*), a scathing commentary on the uselessness of athletes, includes the following indictment of both athletic statues and their honorees: λαμπροὶ δ' ἐν ἥβῃ καὶ πόλεως ἀγάλματα / φοιτῶσ' ("they flit about, gorgeous in their youth, the *agalmata* of the city"). Eurpides does occasionally use *agalma* in the archaic sense to mean simply "thing of delight" (e.g., *HF* 425; *Supp.* 373, 1163, and perhaps also 371, where Diggle emends to ἄμυγμα; likely at fr. 386 [*Theseus*], ἀνόνατον ἄγαλμ' … οἴκοισι, said of a child), in which cases there is no compelling reason to posit an allusion to statues. However, as Kurke is correct to point out, in reference to this fragment, at this date, *agalmata* are more likely to be statues than "objects of admiration."[129] Also the context (athletes) lends itself well to an association with statues. The generic and ultimately gratuitous *beauty* that is implied by the mere mention of statues (since, in Classical Greece,

---

[126] LSJ, s.v. ii; cf. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 280; Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 204; Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 323.

[127] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 323–324.

[128] Cf. Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 125: "lit., 'statues', with reference to statuesque physique," who cautions, however, that the lines are "most open to doubts"; the lines are bracketed by Diggle.

[129] Leslie Kurke, "The Economy of *Kudos*," in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*, Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, eds. (New York and Oxford, 1998), pp. 131–163 (163, n. 97); cf. Steiner, *Images in Mind*, p. 228.

all statues were beautiful) underlies the image. In his discussion of the metaphor in fr. 282, Kurtz draws an interesting comparison with statues in the agora, standing around, so to speak, with nothing to do but look beautiful, while others in the vicinity are hard at work.[130] The artificiality of statues, that edge on reality that is the natural domain of images and with which art may do as it wishes, may please or disquiet, and it is never more lethal than when it does both at the same time.

The implied comparison with statues, if I am correct, is even more precious in an extended genre vignette that involves the cross-referencing of genders and quite possibly statuary. The famous cross-dressing episode of *Bacchae* is at once humorous, parodic, and disturbing in that it points up the feminine characteristics of a male protagonist who has exhibited signs of disdain for women, and allows for the possibility that his obsessive interest in the activities of the Bacchae has a psychological dimension that is left unstated.[131] At *Ba.* 821, when Dionysos in the guise of the Stranger first suggests to the overly curious young king of Thebes, Pentheus, that he dress as a woman in order to spy on the Bacchantes, women's garments are described as βυσσίνους πέπλους ("of fine linen"), the same type used for wrapping mummies (Hdt. 2. 86) and for wounds (id. 7. 181), as has been noted, and thus the very finest fabric available. Their delicacy and lightness is emphasized again in the phrase στεῖλαί … ἀμφὶ χρωτί ("to array … around the skin," *Ba.* 821). Like Creon's daughter in Euripides' *Medea* who met a horrific death in a beautiful, but poisoned gown, Pentheus too will die horribly in a very fine ladies' dress.[132] Though it is not made explicit by Euripides, I propose that statues are the intended comparandum for the lengthy description of the dressing of Pentheus by the Stranger.

For the *Bacchae* scene the clinging, wet-drapery look of the late fifth-century offers a perfectly adequate comparison. However, a more exotic

---

[130] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 571.

[131] An earlier version of my analysis of the cross-dressing scene in *Ba.* appears in Stieber, *The Poetics of Appearance*, pp. 123–125 and 133–134. For more on the humor of the scene, see Bernd Seidensticker, "Comic Elements in Euripides' *Bacchae*," *American Journal of Philology* 99 (1978), 303–320 (316–319). For ritual transvestism in Dionysiac and other contexts in Archaic and Classical Athens, as reflected in imagery on vases, see Margaret C. Miller, "Reexamining Transvestism in Archaic and Classical Athens: The Zewadski Stamonos," *American Journal of Archaeology* 103 (1999), 223–253.

[132] Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 176–177, emphasizes the oriental (= effeminate) overtones of the description of the dress. Heracles dies in a clinging poisoned chiton, a gift of Deianira, at S. *Tr.* 767–769.

source, the Archaic korai statues, most particularly, those from the Athenian acropolis, once again suggests itself as a preferable visual parallel. These iconic images from the sixth and early-fifth centuries BC represent young women of Pentheus' age who, while seemingly demure from the front, are all but naked when seen from behind, where the clothing becomes so diaphanous as to have virtually no plasticity. The emphasis on lightness and transparency of garments, combined with the pronounced youth of Pentheus, hints at a direct acquaintance with, or memory of, the dress patterns of the age-appropriate, once ubiquitous archaic korai figures. These statues offered an old-fashioned stylistic precursor of the heavy, opaque Classical peplos and chiton which, even in its wet-look phase, whatever its material basis, unlike the dress of the korai, could hardly be described as light. That Euripides intends an analogy between the young king dressing and a familiar Archaic female statuary type is strengthened when an excited Pentheus uses language suggestive of the "dedication" of votive statues like the korai as he turns himself over to the Stranger for the *kosmêsis* of his hair: ἰδού, σὺ κόσμει· σοὶ γὰρ ἀνακείμεσθα δή ("sure, be my [hair]dresser, for I am dedicated to you completely," *Ba.* 934). There may be a deliberate *double entendre* in Euripides' choice of language here; as commentators have noticed, ἀνακεῖμαι is the passive form of ἀνατίθημι ("to dedicate a statue").[133]

At *Ba.* 833 we learn that the king's dress is also to be ποδήρεις ("foot-length"), likely an allusion to the means by which proper length is assessed.[134] That allusion is made even clearer when Pentheus (vv. 935–938), criticized in a mocking tone by the Stranger for the skewed arrangement of his dress, checks it by looking from one side to another at the fall of the hem of the chiton against his feet in a manner that recalls the fatal dressing scene in *Medea*. There, Glaukê (*Med.* 1164–1166), having donned the deadly garment sent by Medea, and before the poison takes effect, spends a few moments basking in its look and feel on her body, as would any woman trying on a new dress. Glaukê may not, however, turn judgment over to a full-length mirror, for she possesses only a small one

[133] LSJ, s. v. ἀνακεῖμαι, i; ἀνατίθημι, ii; Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 194; Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 224, interpret the significance of the word choice differently.

[134] Both Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 177, and Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 214–215, citing ancient sources, note that the term is used specifically of the costume of maenads and of Dionysos himself almost as if it were a technical term; however, this would not negate the possibility of an additional touch of realism by way of an allusion to more typical, daily life garb, as represented in the korai. Seaford's suggestion that in tragedy this term used of male dress connotes the garment worn by a corpse is also appropriate.

in which to arrange the poisoned crown in her hair (*Med.* 1161), so she checks her appearance in the only way she knows, stretching her toes in every direction like a ballerina as she glances with approval at the fall of the hemline over her foot, gauging it for proper length and drape over the foot and ankle (πολλὰ πολλάκις / τένοντ᾽ ἐς ὀρθὸν ὄμμασι σκοπουμένη, "over and over, inspecting [it] with her eyes at the straight tendon," *Med.* 1165–1166).[135] In just such a manner we must imagine Pentheus' brief surveillance of the fall of his garment, the result of which allows him to agree with the Stranger that the right side is off, but the left falls correctly at the ankle. (Pentheus' instincts, by the way, seem perfectly natural. Has he cross-dressed before?[136])

As articulated by the Stranger, the king it seems is confronted with three distinct problems regarding his female attire (vv. 935–936): His ζῶναι ("girdles") are slack (χαλῶσι), the pleats (στολίδες) are not evenly arrayed (ἑξῆς), and the hem of the dress is too long, falling below the ankles (ὑπὸ σφυροῖσι). The last likely implies criticism of the manner in which he is walking, since, were he lifting his skirts in properly ladylike fashion, they would not come across as too long, even if they are. The source of the trouble appears to be some sort of faulty belting or hiking, whether over the hip or perhaps at the shoulders, where a linen chiton would normally be pinned. Hiking the skirts to the proper length *and* picking them up properly when walking, as many of the korai demonstrate, allow for the creation of both longitudinal and latitudinal pleats to which the wearer's close attention must be given. The former will be judged by evenness of size and separation, while the latter might be

135 Denys L. Page, *Euripides Medea* (Oxford, 1938), p. 158 (cf. Donald M. Mastronarde, *Euripides Medea* [Cambridge, Eng., 2002], p. 355), associates τένοντ᾽ ἐς ὀρθόν precisely with the Achilles tendon at the heel of the foot. This would seem an appropriate length for a peplos, to judge from Acr. 679 (the "Peplos" kore), but a bit too short for a chiton. Although the deadly gift is called a "peplos" (*Med.* 983, 786, 1159, 1188), the generic term for garment in tragedy, it is more likely to have been a linen chiton than a woolen peplos, since it is described as light (vv. 786, 1188) and would need to make direct contact, killing Glaukê by clinging closely to her flesh and devouring it (vv. 1188–1189); a peplos would normally require an undergarment.

136 On transvestism, especially in komastic contexts, as a cultural phenomenon among the elite in Late Archaic and Classical Athens, see Miller, "Reexamining Transvestism," esp. pp. 246–253. One might object that, since part of the purpose of the scene is to show a Pentheus who is *alienated* from his normal self, there can be no question of habitual cross dressing. However, the scene is striking for its length and detail, almost to the point of excess, which opens up the possibility, even likelihood, of parody; E. is not above allowing comic moments to intrude in tragic scenes.

judged in the same way that a modern tailor determines the appropriate length of a man's trousers by making sure that the ends create one and only one crease as they lie on his insteps; the back will then take care of itself. Pentheus is probably to be pictured as looking down at the front and sides of the garment rather than at the back, as most commentators suggest, since he would better be able to judge the fall of the pleats without lifting his feet. To visualize the niceties of aristocratic Archaic dress we need only consult again the korai with their manifold ways of arranging the various components. Even though many of the statues no longer retain their lower extremities, enough intact examples survive to illustrate the basic principles involved in the *Bacchae* dressing scene. The neatness with which very narrow longitudinal pleats might be arrayed in a finely woven garment belted at the waist can best be seen on "Hera of Samos" in the Louvre, to cite only the most outstanding example, while in the case of a heavier woolen belted garment, this feature is attested in the form of two wide lateral pleats ending in single perfect omega folds on Acr. Mus. kore 679. Latitudinal pleats are less common, but they can be seen in the neat stack of omega folds between the feet of korai Acr. Mus. 683, 493 and 510, among others.[137]

Furthering his transformation of Pentheus into a passable *mimêma* of a young woman the Stranger announces his intention to outfit the king with κόμην ... ταναόν ("long hair," *Ba.* 831). Dodds suggests that this would be a wig rather than a reference to unbinding his own long hair.[138] Whether Pentheus is to don a wig or let down his own hair, we should imagine feminine-looking hair worn in the style of the Archaic period rather than the Classical. And since he must pass for a woman, it is preferable to think again of the korai rather than the kouroi, who, while they do wear their hair long, display considerably less variety and finesse in crimping, braiding, and curling. My contention that the imagery of the

[137] "Hera of Samos": Karakasi, *Archaic Korai*, pls. 4–7; omega folds on Acr. 679: Karakasi, op. cit., pl. 138c–d; Acr. 683: Karakasi, op. cit., pl. 264a; Acr. 493: Karakasi, op. cit., pl. 180; Acr. 510: Richter, *Korai*, fig. 431. For a different interpretation of *Ba.* 935–938, Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 224–225, who focuses on the ritualistic significance of the dress, as opposed to the genre element, which I emphasize.

[138] Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 177, thinks that ἐπὶ σῷ κρατί "would have little point" if the loosening of long hair is meant; Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 214, citing the Kritios boy for long hair bound up at the back in the Late-Archaic/Early-Classical manner, concludes that either a wig or loosened hair is possible.

cross-dressing scene in *Bacchae* matches the look of the korai does not disregard or negate the possibility that the korai are themselves dressed for religious ritual and that real Dionysiac dress, imagery and ritual is being evoked in the play, as critics are keen to point out. However, since Dionysos himself was identified with women, wore women's clothes (cf. Ar. *Ra.*) and was regarded as an effeminate figure, the point almost becomes moot. One of Euripides' favorite synonyms for hair, βόστρυχος (used, for example, of Glaukê's hair as she puts on the poisoned crown at *Med.* 1160; cf. βοτρυώδεος, used of the curl-framed cheek of Antigone at *Ph.* 1485[139]), is also used of vines or tendrils, anything twisted or curled, imagery which is more suitable to Archaic than to Classical tresses, which are more wavy than curly. Finally, at *Ba.* 833, as the crowning touch of his appropriation of female attire, Pentheus is to wear a μίτρα in his hair. This accouterment has for the most part been associated with the regalia of Dionysos and his followers, as seen on vases. However, the term appears also to be used in general of any fashionable oriental type of headband, especially for women, exactly like those worn in great variety by the korai.[140] Suitably crowned, Pentheus' transformation is complete: He is an Archaic kore![141]

---

[139] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 562: "adorned with/shaded by spiralling or corkscrew curls."

[140] For examples, see Karakasi, *Archaic Korai*, passim. Cf. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 177–178; Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 215; Miller, "Reexamining Transvestism," pp. 230–232, n. 28 and 240. At least two very different types of female headgear have been commonly identified on vases as "mitrai": A band worn around the head and a more substantial, turban-like structure, sometimes with the hair pulled through the crown; on this debate, see Miller, loc. cit., with further references. An even more specific type of long-flapped headgear, identified as a Persian mitra and worn under a helmet by Athena, Amazons and warriors in the early Classical period, is isolated by E.R. Knauer, "Mitra and Kerykeion. Some Reflections on Symbolic Attributes in the Art of the Classical Period," *Archäologischer Anzieger* (1992), 373–399, and its iconography associated with the Persian wars. Only the headband-type applies to the korai.

[141] Helene P. Foley, "The Masque of Dionysus," rev. vers. in Mossman, *Oxford Readings in Euripides*, pp. 343–344, with n. 4, and passim, emphasizes the unusually prominent role of spectacle (Aristotle's *opsis*) in this play: "I do not intend to imply here that the *Bacchae* abandons words as a mode of effective communication; this would be absurd in any drama. But both Dionysus in the prologue and the chorus in the parodos place extraordinary emphasis on presenting the god's divinity through voice, costume, music and symbolic actions—that is, non-verbal means of apprehending the god." My suggestion that the cross-dressing scene is intended to evoke statuary imagery would be in keeping with Foley's argument that the play relies heavily on spectacle to attain its effects.

Her Living Image

This much is clear: Bodily beauty has served as a bellwether for interpretation of much of the language that pertains to statues discussed thus far. For the aesthetics of Greek statuary, in Euripidean drama as in real life in the second half of the fifth century BC, revolve around this single, overriding principle. At least until the Hellenistic period, figural sculpture-in-the-round is concentrated exclusively on beauty, of male and female, both of form and of content. Painters also portrayed bodily beauty, of course. However, for some reason statues are more often discussed in the ancient sources in these terms. Perhaps this is because paintings showcase narrative, composition, technique, means of illusionism, and other artistic and conceptual matters whereas sculptures represent self-contained objects with weight, mass, scale, and verifiable, tactile contours; they take up real, as opposed to apparent, space, in the same manner as real humans, and consequently bear up better under a direct one-to-one comparison. Statuary beauty's most formidable competitor is not painting's, but real-life beauty, as rare then as it is now, though it seems that in antiquity there was less interest in it than in the beauty of statues, with one exception: Helen of Troy. Though she may be a whole-cloth fiction, she is nonetheless the most famous historical example of perfect female beauty occurring outside of statuary.

The special relationship between statues and nature was pointed out in the introduction to the chapter. While the topic is too large to take up in the present context, let us consider this relationship a bit further. Contrary to expectations, statuary beauty need not always assume second place to physical perfection in the flesh, Helen's included, as far as lifelikeness and its effects are concerned. Paradoxical as it may be, art can be more lifelike than life, more lifelike than living forms, to judge from literary responses to it through the ages. In brief statuary beauty has an advantage over natural beauty because it can be manipulated, in other words, idealized. From the surviving examples of idealized sculptures, we are invited to think back to reality, rather than the other way around, and to ascertain what ideal beauty actually looked like, we must turn to the idealized statues. To pursue the case of Helen, while we have no idea of her physical appearance, as Homer does not describe her beauty but rather the reactions of others to it (*Il.* 3. 156–160; cf. sholia, ad loc. [Erbse]), we may imagine her, if we care to, as an idealized Greek statue-come-to-life. She is likely to have been, for instance, "deep-girdled," considered a flattering epithet for a woman, but which in the final analysis describes what

would be by modern standards only a modest bosom, since that is what the statues have. Her weight is bound to have been more substantial, and her muscle-tone less defined, than that of the modern supermodel, again to judge from the statues. As for the color of her hair, we do not know, but the statues tell us that it would have been long, abundant, and wavy. The statue is a clear messenger of ancient Greek beauty, the bearer of a visual directive that, as history would have it, has been treated with deference throughout much of the course of western civilization.

When beauty is in residence, in real-life or in statues, *erôs* invariably follows. There indeed have been erotic undertones to many of the interpretations of Euripidean imagery undertaken in the chapter thus far; we may now turn our attention directly to the subject. When bodily beauty and lifelikeness coincide in a work of art, the erotic potential increases exponentially. Along with *erôs* comes all of its contingencies of behavior and expression. Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen* 18, has this in mind when he speaks about paintings and statues, as artisanal products, providing a "sweet sickness (νόσον ἡδεῖαν) for the eyes," with desire being thought of as a kind of pleasurable affliction.[142] This "sickness" attaches itself to the viewing of accomplished works of art whose lifelike beauty is in evidence, and evidently disturbing, in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 416–419, causing "the grace of well-formed statues" of Helen, of course, to become hateful to her abandoned husband, Menelaus, and, his eyes in need, compelling him to banish all thoughts of sex.[143] Her living images haunt like dreams, to a more powerful effect, we may understand, than even the most beautiful woman in the world, in the flesh. Such is the power of art. Nor does it need to be "erotic" or "pornographic" in content or intent to have this effect—there is no chance that Helen's statues were nude—but rather simply *lifelike*.

Bodily beauty, eroticism, sickness, and art, all play a role in one of the most written about statuary references in all of Euripides, *Alcestis* 347–354. In a farewell speech to his dying wife, Admetus makes a promise to commission a portrait statue of Alcestis to replace her in their marriage bed:

---

[142] ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀνδριάντων ποίησις καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἐργασία νόσον ἡδεῖαν παρέσχετο τοῖς ὄμμασιν, *Enc. Hel.* 18; I adopt the text of Douglas M. MacDowell, *Gorgias. Encomium of Helen* (London, 1982), who acknowledges (p. 39) that νόσον is "Dobree's emendation of ὅσον."

[143] εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν / ἔχθεται χάρις ἀνδρί, / ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις / ἔρρει πᾶσ' Ἀφροδίτα, A. *Ag.* 416–419.

… σὺ γάρ μου τέρψιν ἐξείλου βίου.
σοφῇ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων δέμας τὸ σὸν
εἰκασθὲν ἐν λέκτροισιν ἐκταθήσεται,
ᾧ προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας
ὄνομα καλῶν σὸν τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις
δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν·
ψυχρὰν μέν, οἶμαι, τέρψιν, ἀλλ' ὅμως βάρος
ψυχῆς ἀπαντλοίην ἄν.

(… for you have taken the joy out of my life. Your body fashioned as in life by the practiced hand of a master stonecarver shall be stretched out on our bed. I shall fling myself upon this image and caress it all round with my hands; calling your name, I shall seem to hold my own dear wife in my folded arms, although I do not. I think this would be a cold pleasure, but still I would lighten my heavy heart.)

I have argued elsewhere that behind this strange idea and the language used to express it lies a veiled recognition by Admetus, tinged perhaps by no small measure of guilt, that a funerary statue representing a likeness of Alcestis will be commissioned—if it is not in fact already made and erected—to honor her for her noble death on his behalf.[144] The passage from Aristophanes (*Ec.* 1108–1111) discussed above, where Epigenes demonstrates his disdain for the third old woman by suggesting that she be prematurely rendered into a funerary image, makes it clear that life-size funerary statues were known to late fifth-century Athenians, even though the type had long since become obsolete as a grave marker. One wonders whether Euripides had any knowledge whatsoever of those typical Etruscan sarcophagi that show a life-size husband and wife united forever, if in stone, in their conjugal love; unlikely, but they do make a apt visual comparandum.

However, at this time I would like to explore further the evidence for the erotic nature of Admetus' promise, which in my view has not been emphasized enough.[145] The statue is not directly mentioned again. But that it is intended at least in part to be used in the service of sexual gratification is reinforced by another, more overtly eroticized desire expressed by Admetus a little later in the "farewell speech." At vv. 365–367 he promises that his own corpse will eventually be laid side by side with that of Alcestis in the very same coffin: ἐν ταῖσιν αὐταῖς γάρ μ' ἐπισκήψω

---

[144] Stieber, "Statuary in Euripides' *Alcestis*."

[145] Briefly addressed in Mary Stieber, "A Note on A. *Ag.* 410–428 and E. *Alc.* 347–56," *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 52 (1999), 150–158, where further references may be found. The most recent commentary on *Alc.* (L.P.E. Parker, *Euripides Alcestis* [Oxford, 2007], pp. 122–123) makes no mention of the erotic overtones of this "extravagant and bizarre" project.

κέρδροις / σοὶ τούσδε θεῖναι πλευρά τ' ἐκτεῖναι πέλας / πλευροῖσι τοῖς σοῖς ("For I shall order these very children to place me in the same cedar [coffin] and to stretch out my flanks alongside your flanks"). While the sentiment may be honorable, the language is more suggestive than is warranted.[146] What we have is a marginally more demure version of the "body part to body part" locution familiar from lyric poetry like Archilochos fr. 119 (West), where its sexual nature is made explicit: καὶ πεσεῖν δρήστην ἐπ' ἀσκόν, κἀπι γαστρὶ γαστέρα / προσβαλεῖν μηρούς τε μηροῖς ("and to fall upon her working girl's 'wineskin', and to slam belly against belly and thighs against thighs").

Among Euripidean versions of the trope, compare *Supp.* 1020–1021, where Evadne, threatening to join her dead bridegroom Capaneus on his funeral pyre, entertains a hopeful vision of πόσει συμμείξασα φίλῳ, / χρῶτα χροΐ πέλας θεμένα ("commingling with my dear husband, pressing my flesh against his"); the inclusion of συμμείξασα leaves little doubt of the sexual overtones to her wish.[147] In his commentary on the passage Collard observes that the "paregmenon … χρῶτα χρωτί" (as at, e.g., Theoc. 2. 140) or, alternatively, one of several more chaste but comparable locutions, is often adopted to describe close embraces; thus, we have παρειὰν παρηίδι at *Hec.* 410, where the embrace is between mother and daughter, and στέρνοις στέρνα at *El.* 1321, where it is between brother and sister.[148] It is true that such sentiments need not, under normal circumstances, be considered erotic. I would argue, however, that Admetus' anatomical specification, πλευρά πλευροῖσι, is inescapably sexual in its implications. That "flanks" may serve as a euphemism for sexual intimacy is made clear, for example, at *Hec.* 826–827, where Hecuba, begging Agamemnon to spare Polyxena, appeals to his sexual relationship with another of her daughters, Cassandra: πρὸς σοῖσι πλευροῖς παῖς ἐμὴ κοιμίζεται / ἡ φοιβάς ("my daughter the prophetess sleeps by your side").

His own language thus allows Admetus to implicate himself as to the carnal nature of his sentiment, and while eroticism is not out of place—the two are married, after all—this last promise, coming so quickly upon the heels of the oddly imagined statue, might understandably make the listener a little squeamish. Other instances of envisioned joint burials in

[146] D.J. Conacher, *Euripides Alcestis* (Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng., 1988), p. 170, also detects the erotic tone of *Alc.* 365–367, deferring to Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, pp. 370–371, who cites as additional comparanda S. *Ant.* 1223, *Tr.* 1225, E. *Supp.* 1021.

[147] Cf. James Morwood, *Euripides Suppliant Women* (Oxford, 2007), p. 223.

[148] Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, pp. 370–371.

Euripides, Cassandra and Agamemnon at *Tr.* 449, Menelaus and Helen at *Hel.* 985–986, and Orestes and Electra at *Or.* 1053, the first two, certainly, and the last, possibly, erotic in tone, while they do lack the modified "bump and grind" formulation, lend support to such an interpretation. The νυμφίου πέλας τάφου at *Tr.* 449 is somewhat ambiguous, but seems to imply that Cassandra will be tossed on top of or beside the tomb of Agamemnon. Though it has been overlooked by commentators, there is little doubt of the sexual implications of these two being buried in proximity, since they were neither husband and wife nor lovers in any real sense, and sex was all that was between them. A third example, that of Andromache and child at *Andr.* 511–512, does not have erotic overtones, and certainly not all husband and wife burials should be seen as *inappropriately* erotic in their implications.[149] At *Il.* 23. 82–84 the ghost of Patroclus requests of Achilles that their bones eventually lie together, not apart; a sexual relationship between the two has been considered possible, even likely, from at least the time of Aeschylus' lost *Myrmidons* (Pl. *Sym.* 180a; *TrGF* 3 134a, 135 and possibly 136), although Homer does not verify this. All said the suggestion of eroticism that pervades such common burials is hard to deny, and not just to modern sensibilities, since the language used to characterize them leaves this the only possible deduction.

As for Admetus in *Alcestis*, later, at vv. 897–899, the bereft husband asserts that he has been thwarted in an actual attempt to join his wife in her coffin and be buried alive alongside her. Confronted with this latest revelation, those listeners/readers who choose to take Admetus' claim as seriously as the earlier series of equally bombastic promises may be forgiven for concluding that Euripides' Admetus is a necrophiliac as well as an agalmataphiliac. In regards to the passage L.P.E. Parker points out the rarity of the use of intransitive ῥίπτω in the active, meaning "to throw oneself," or "to fling," though he does not pursue the implications.[150] I suggest that the unorthodox use of the verb underscores the force and the determination with which Admetus imagines himself propelled into the tomb and, inevitably, onto Alcestis' dead body, and adds to the impression that a degree of sexual intent lies behind the thought.

---

[149] On husband-and-wife and sibling burials in the same tomb in antiquity, see Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults*, p. 80, who does not, however, suggest that there is an erotic dimension to such burials.

[150] Parker, *Euripides Alcestis*, p. 232, who lists the comparanda.

At this point it is useful to reintroduce another Euripidean statuary reference that has already been discussed at length above for the additional light it may shed on Admetus' intentions at *Alc.* 347–354. This is fr. 125 (*Andromeda*), where the real-life Andromeda is temporarily mistaken by Perseus for a statue. Aristophanes, as we have seen, exploits the sexual potential of this scene in lampooning it at *Thesm.* 1105–1124. He does not replicate verbatim all of the elements of the original fragment as we have it from various sources, including a scholion at *Thesm.* 1105; for instance, a word for statue does not appear. Nevertheless, assuming that audience members would need to be fully conversant with the original scene in order to comprehend the parody, we may safely deduce that all of the essential elements are in place in the comic treatment, including the allusion to a statue, an important but often overlooked point.[151] In the parody it is Euripides himself disguised as Perseus who mistakes his old kinsman for the *statue* of Andromeda tied to a rock of his own play, (vv. 1105–1106) and immediately falls in love with "her/it." An exchange develops along obvious lines as the Scythian graphically demonstrates to an uncomprehending Euripides that "he" is neither a "she" nor, by implication, a statue. Verse 1122 of the exchange is most revealing. The character Euripides says, using language strikingly similar to that of the real playwright's own character Admetus at *Alc.* 349–350, that he would like to release "her" or "it" for the following purpose: πεσεῖν ἐς εὐνὴν καὶ γαμήλιον λέχος (loosely, "to fall into the sack with me"), a probable spoof of the tragic diction of the real Euripides.[152] Admetus, it will be remembered, intends "to fall upon" the statue of Alcestis (ᾧ προσπεσοῦμαι), using a verb with a distinctly sexual connotation; compare Archilichos' πεσεῖν ἐπ' ἀσκόν (fr. 119 [West]). As a kind of euphemism for sex, to be sure, the language (i.e., πεσεῖν, πίτνειν, and compounds in an intimate context) is not restricted to irreverent occasions; it appears at Sophocles, *Oedipus the King* 1209–1210: παιδὶ καὶ πατρὶ / θαλαμηπόλῳ

[151] Cf. Golder, "Making a Scene," p. 10, who makes the same point more elaborately. Peter Rau, *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Munich, 1967), p. 86, observes that the Aristophanic image is "abkürzend durch eine direkte Bezeichnung ihrer Schönheit," while the statue simile is replaced, for humorous effect, by a ship simile that would also put the audience in mind of *HF* 1095–1097, Heracles' awakening from his sleep, tied to a broken column, comparing himself to a moored ship. Ar. thus succeeds in spoofing two famous scenes in E.

[152] Gilbert Murray, *The Thesmophoriazusae of Aristophanes* (London, 1920), p. 121, does not believe the line comes from *Androm.*: "More probably, if not composed by Aristophanes in the style of Euripides, it was borrowed … from some other of the Poet's tragedies;" he compares γαμηλίου λέχους at *Or.* 1050, which Diggle brackets.

πεσεῖν, Oedipus being the referent; compare also Eurpides' *Helen* 1093, a respectful address to Hera which refers to her relationship with Zeus: Δίοισιν ἐν λέκτροις πίτνεις.

Whether irreverent or matter-of-fact, the sexual innuendo of the language on all of these occasions is clear; there can thus be no mistaking its implications at *Alc.* 350. At *Alc.* 1059 Admetus is explicit with his language, when he worries what people will think of his "falling between the sheets of a new woman" (ἐν ἄλλης δεμνίοις πίτνειν νέας) so soon after his wife's death. Since imagined statues figure in the Euripidean plays *Andromeda, Alcestis, Helen*, and *Protesilaos*, to name just the ones we know about, the idea of going to bed with a statue or with another counterfeit image (such as, for example, an old man mistaken for a young woman) is pounced upon as the butt of a great joke at the expense of both men called Euripides, the fictional and the historical figure.[153] For our purposes the pitch of Aristophanes' spoof could reveal that contemporary audiences also perceived erotic undertones, whether intended or not, behind Admetus' wish in *Alcestis* that might have been regarded as not at all out of place in a drama that was both κωμικωτέραν and σατυρικώτερον, according to an ancient *Hypothesis*.[154] In my view the language and sentiment of *Thesm.* 1122 resembles *Alc.* 349–350 closely enough to pass for a ribald parody thereof.

The inappropriately erotic implications of the (obviously!) well-intentioned sentiments of a distraught and overwrought husband and about-to-be widower might be explicable in light of the extraordinary circumstances in which this particular married couple finds itself, one agreeing to die prematurely to save the other an early death. And yet it must be said that the lady at whom these—if my interpretation is

---

[153] In E.'s *Prot.* a slave mistakes a statue of Protesilaos in bed with Laodamia for a real lover and informs Laodamia's father, a sequence of events that ultimately results in the girl's death. On the evidence for the plot of E.'s play, see, e.g., M. Mayer, "Der Protesilaus von Euripides," *Hermes* 20 (1885), pp. 101–134; Sophie Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (Cambridge, Eng., 1958), p. 67; and, more recently, John Heath, "The Failure of Orpheus," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994), 163–196 (172–174); for a more general discussion, see Maurizio Bettini, *The Portrait of the Lover*, trans. Laura Gibbs (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1999), pp. 9–14.

[154] The information that *Alc.* was performed in place of a satyr-play and that it is κωμικωτέραν and σατυρικώτερον—on account of which modern critics and commentators are in the habit of referring to the play as "pro-satyric"—comes from the *Hypothesis* by Aristophanes of Byzantium; for a discussion of the debatable status of this *Hypothesis*, see Conacher, *Euripides Alcestis*, pp. 29–30. The recent analysis by Parker, *Euripides Alcestis*, pp. xx–xxiii, is highly critical of the validity of the *Hypothesis*' claims.

correct—borderline sentiments are aimed, Euripides' beloved Alcestis (*Alc.* 991–994 and passim), is not at all worthy of them. On the other hand, another woman who is reduced to a statue in a Euripidean play, Helen of the *Helen*, is, to judge from most accounts, not necessarily a lady, and somewhat more deserving of male agalmataphiliac fantasies. Moreover, unlike Alcestis, Helen has the opportunity to oversee the fulfillment of some of them.

Given what we have seen of Euripides' interest in statues it is not surprising that he chose as the theme for a dramatization of Helen's and Menelaus' reunion after the Trojan War the alternate, so-called palinodic version of the myth that has an εἴδωλον of Helen going to Troy while the woman herself was detained in Egypt, thereby relieving her of the burden of being considered the cause of the war.[155] Euripides' commitment to this version of the story is already documented in an earlier play, *Electra* (1280–1283). He takes up the theme in earnest in *Helen*, which, as is generally acknowledged, shares with *Alcestis* certain features more suited to comic drama, including a happy ending.[156]

The *locus classicus* for the revised version of the Helen story, the "Palinode" of Stesichorus (*PMGF* 192), is too fragmentary to provide any information about its most intriguing aspect, the exact nature of this mysterious *eidôlon*. Stesichorus' blinding by Helen in retribution for an earlier, condemnatory poem about her, in response to which he wrote the palinode and recovered his sight, is conveyed in a number of ancient sources, among them Plato's *Phaedrus* 243 a, the source of the preserved fragment.[157] The fragment itself does not mention the double: "This tale that they tell is not true: you did not sail in those benched ships or come to the towers of Troy."[158] A papyrus fragment (*PMGF* 193) that preserves a portion of a commentary on lyric poetry, supplies the information that Stesichorus has an *eidôlon* going in her place, and also suggests that there were two palinodes that promoted this version of the story, providing the first lines of both of them; it does not, however, offer any further

---

155 On the history of this version, see, most recently, William Allan, *Euripides Helen* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 18–28; and in general, Norman Austin, *Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom* (Ithaca, NY, 1994).

156 Dale, *Euripides Helen*, pp. vii–xvi. Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 187, disavows a connection between *El.* 1280–1283 and the plot of *Hel.*: "... there is no compulsion to see these lines as anticipating that play."

157 A full list may be found in *PMGF*, ad loc.; Allan, *Euripides Helen*, pp. 18–22, evaluates the sources. See, recently, Adrian Kelly, "Stesichorus and Helen," *Museum Helveticum* 64 (2007), 1–21.

158 Trans. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, p. 89.

information about the nature of the *eidôlon*. Herodotus, who might be expected to have been encouraged by the oddity of this tale to investigate it, had he heard it during his visit to Memphis, is also unhelpful; although he relates an alternative tale that has Helen herself left behind by Paris in Egypt on their way to Troy, he does not mention the double (2. 113–120). While this version of the story also exculpates her, it has the additional effect of making the protracted war—which went on anyway, since the Greeks did not believe the Trojans when they told them Helen was not among them, according to the historian's account—seem even more senseless. A scholiast to Aristides 1. 131. 1 (Dindorf) is the only source to brave the unknown, passing on a fascinating detail of the *eidôlon* myth, which it attributes to Stesichorus, that Paris was left to be consoled by a *painting* of Helen (ἐν πίνακι τὸ εἴδωλον αὐτῆς γεγραμμένον) with which to stoke his love. The scholiast, however, discounts the story altogether on the grounds that Homer, though aware of the story, tastefully rejected it (cf. Hdt. 2. 116–117).

Critics and commentators for some reason have not been particularly interested in ascertaining the precise nature of Helen's double, whether in Euripides' play, our immediate concern, or elsewhere in literature. Among those who consider at all the question of the compositon of the *eidôlon* in *Helen*, Richard Kannicht reviews additional ancient sources that confirm its "cloud-like" nature, and emphasizes that it possesses both divine and mortal capabilities; as an εἴδωλον ἔμπνουν (*Hel.* 34), he disassociates it with εἴδωλα ἄψυχα made by artisans, such as Laodamia's image of Protesilaos and the statue of his wife that Admetus desires at *Alc.* 348–354, discussed above.[159] William Allan observes only that αἰθήρ is used interchangeably with οὐρανός "for the material basis of the εἴδωλον."[160] Steiner does not speculate about the precise nature of the *eidôlon*, but she does point to its ethereality, while Karen Bassi dismisses the possibility that it could be "an artistic substitute," preferring to see it as some sort of "double."[161]

There is admittedly not a lot to work with. Whether the *eidôlon* in Euripides' *Helen* is some sort of robotic statue or simply a ghost is not entirely clear, although the latter is more likely, since it is made of air (*Hel.* 34, 584, 605, [705], 750, 1219, and implicitly at 32) and it appears

159 Kannicht, *Euripides Helena*, 1, pp. 36–38 and 2, pp. 27–28.

160 Allan, *Euripides Helen*, p. 212 (ad *Hel.* 584, comparing vv. 34 and 605).

161 Steiner, *Images in Mind*, pp. 191–193; Karen Bassi, "Helen and the Discourse of Denial in Stesichorus' Palinode," *Arethusa* 26 (1993), 51–75 (63, n. 27).

to be alive (v. 583). It is possible that the *eidôlon* is a form that Helen is able to assume at will, or, at least at the will of the gods. At *Or.* 1494–1495 the Phrygian slave relates how Orestes and Pylades, engaged in the act of killing Helen, are distracted for a moment by the unexpected arrival of Hermione; they seize the girl and then turn back to her mother, only to find that she has been spirited by Apollo away from the house, a "phantom," once again (ἁ δ' [ἐκ θαλάμων] / ἐγένετο διαπρὸ δωμάτων ἄφαντος). On the other hand this *eidôlon* is to be regarded as "fashioned" (πλάσαντος), a rather more concrete, craftsmanlike term used of its creation at *Hel.* 585, and it is called an ἄγαλμα at v. 705 (which Diggle, however, brackets) and at v. 1219, but otherwise, artisanal terms are not especially used of it, and it is probably best not to push the notion of "statue" very far.

At the root of this story, however, is the idea that a divinity's mimetic act of creating a duplicate version of a human being, whatever it is made out of, is closely akin to the notion of a sculptor imitating nature mimetically in a work of art that represents a human being. And it is typical of Euripides to consider from various angles the character of the *eidôlon* as a made object, even if he does not appear to have fully resolved the issue of its precise substance. Whether plastic or ethereal, this thing is, apparently, tangible. At *Hel.* 31–36 Helen relates that Hera made the *eidôlon* (Zeus is the creator in *El.*) out of "sky" (οὐρανοῦ … ἄπο, v. 34) as a way of "turning into wind" (ἐξηνέμωσε, v. 32) her body as it lies, a sexual prize, in the bed of Paris. The language is deliberately chosen; Allan notes that the only other occurrence of the unusual verb in v. 32 is also in Euripides, at *Andr.* 938.[162] Since the *eidôlon* is made of air, it quite literally (not metaphorically, as LSJ, s. v. ἐξανεμίζω, states) transforms the object of Paris' desire, Helen's body, into wind in his very bed.[163] That the actual conjugal bed is meant is confirmed at vv. 35–36 in a familiar Euripidean play on appearances versus reality: καὶ δοκεῖ μ' ἔχειν, / κενὴν δόκησιν, οὐκ ἔχων ("He thinks he holds me, [but it is] an empty deduction [or 'apparition'], since he does not"). Menelaus too, we must believe, was to sleep with this simulacrum after winning his errant "wife" back upon victory at Troy and being reunited with "her" as they sail back to Sparta.

---

[162] Allan, *Euripides Helen*, p. 151, who adds: "To begin the description of Hera's response with this striking word emphasizes both the ingenuity and the power of the goddess."

[163] Cf. Allan, *Euripides Helen*, p. 151; A.C. Pearson, *The Helena of Euripides* (Cambridge, Eng., 1903), p. 73, who considers the verb's sense "literal," although he does not explain; Paley^2, p. 127; Dale, *Euripides Helen*, p. 71.

As Euripides' play unfolds "she" has apparently been deposited in a cave on the couple's arrival in Egypt, where, we might expect, further sexual relations were to occur. Thus Admetus' wish to go to bed with a statue and Paris' and Menelaus' actual bedding of an *eidôlon* of Helen fall into the same category of unnatural, insubstantial, and ultimately deceptive conjugal relations with a counterfeit of one's beloved, her living image.[164]

Wiped Clean

The ubiquitous presence of the *eidôlon* of Helen in Euripides' eponymous play likely factors into a striking simile involving an ἄγαλμα at *Hel.* 262–263. Helen is bemoaning her beauty, the cause of so much misunderstanding, suffering, and death for the Greeks. In the course of a lengthy monologue she gives vent to a secret wish that the exterior signs of her loveliness were removable, a sentiment foolish in its naiveté but nevertheless sympathetic in a play in which she is portrayed favorably: εἴθ' ἐξαλειφθεῖσ' ὡς ἄγαλμ' αὖθις πάλιν / αἴσχιον εἶδος ἔλαβον ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ("If only I might assume a plainer aspect[165] instead of this beauty, like an *agalma* made pristine again, its colors obliterated."). There has been considerable disagreement concerning which medium, painting or sculpture, is the referent for this *agalma*. Both have been argued in the past, with the edge generally given to painting.[166] The confusion is understandable, given that marble sculptures were routinely painted in antiquity, a characteristic that is referred to as polychromy, allowing for the possibility of having it both ways. Then there is the intriguing description of the *eidôlon* itself as ἐν πίνακι, mentioned by the scholiast to Aristides and attributed to Stesichorus (see above), which if known to Euripides, could tempt an interpreter to favor painting. A close examination of the language of the passage will help to uncover Euripides' intentions.

[164] On the significance of the empty "barbarian's bed" in E.'s *Hel.*, see Austin, *Helen of Troy*, pp. 143–145 and 162–163; for a more extensive and wide-ranging consideration of the meaning and ramifications of the *eidôlon* of Helen, see Steiner, *Images in Mind*, pp. 191–194 and 286–292.

[165] Ewald Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise in den Tragödien des Euripides* (Amsterdam, 1985), p. 609, with comparanda in n. 71, makes the interesting observation that the use of εἶδος in this passage "vereinen sich die beiden Aspekte 'Aussehen' und 'Gestalt' untrennbar miteinander."

[166] Xanthakis-Karamanos, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*, pp. 82–83, n. 3, conveniently lists the *Hel.* commentators and their opinions either side of this controversy. See below for further discussion.

Interpretation hinges on the meaning of the verb ἐξαλείφω. Curiously, a type of ladies' unguent box is called an ἐχάλειπτρον (LSJ, s. v.), which Miller suggests is a lidded pyxis that served as a "cold cream box" or "vaseline jar."[167] The verb at *Hel.* 262 might then, on one level, serve as a linguistic reminder of a feature of Helen's daily toiletry. If so, there is a further degree of irony in the fact that these unguents would have *improved* her looks. In verbal form the term appears at *Hecuba* 590 to mean "wiped clean," only there it is Hecuba's φρήν that is wiped and no direct simile with art works is put forward. Regardless of context, however, the verb brings with it unmistakable technical overtones, as every commentator understands; this is especially true in a play as rich in images inspired by the visual arts as is *Hecuba*. LSJ (s. v. ἐξαλείφω) lists the technical, practical meanings first ("whitewash, plaster or wash over," and so forth), with additional usages following under "metaph." ("wipe out in one's mind, destroy," and the like). The appearance of an unusual verb, heavy with technical connotations, merely a few verses after the Polyxena episode which left the audience visualizing a work of art (*Hec.* 560–561), allows the later phrase to serve as a kind of postscript to the earlier, overwhelming simile. Collard is of this mind when he interprets *Hec.* 590: "like sponging away a fresco."[168] While there would be little sense to that particular activity, rendering it unlikely that the technically savvy playwright would make such a labored and improbable analogy, Collard is on the right track.

An analogous image is found at Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1328–1329, though without the verb ἐξαλείφω: εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ, / βολαῖς ὑγρώσσων σπόγγος ὤλεσεν γραφήν ("if one is unfortunate, a wetted sponge destroys the image with its blows"); either writing or, more likely, painting is the referent here, reflecting a common source of confusion in rendering γραφή.[169] Kannicht compares the sentiment of Helen [?] in adesp. fr. *TrGF* 2, 174 (εἴθ' ὤφελεν τὸ κάλλος ὅ με διώλεσεν / κακῶς ὀλέλθαι, "Would that the beauty that cruelly destroyed me be destroyed"), which he believes is from another Helen tragedy, possibly by Sophocles.[170] There, however, without a corresponding image, the impact is substantially diminished. The verb itself occurs under similar circum-

[167] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 721–722.
[168] Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, p. 162.
[169] Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 3, p. 622, prefers writing, comparing S. *Tr.* 683, but ultimately settles in favor of painting or drawing.
[170] Kannicht, *Euripides Helena*, 2, p. 89, with my trans.; cf. S. *Tr.* 25, 465.

stances in Euripides' fr. 618 (*Peleus*), where γραφήν makes clear that the reference is to painting (or drawing) rather than sculpture.[171] Likewise the technical meaning is implicit in the verb's appearance at *IA* 1486, where Iphigenia speaks of "wiping clean the oracles" (θέσφατ' ἐχαλείψω).[172] Of the remaining Euripidean occurrences of the verb, at *Hipp.* 1241 and *IT* 698, I am reluctant to try to coax out a reference or allusion to art in either instance, while in fr. 1041 (incert.) it need not, but could have artisinal overtones; without context it is impossible to say. Clearly, however, this technical term was quite popular with Euripides.

Among the occurrences in Euripides of the verb ἐξαλείφω with artisanal overtones, the *Helen* passage most fully sustains and exploits the technical aspects implicit in the term. The presence of ἄγαλμα and the fact that Helen, the most beautiful of all women, is *de facto* the easiest to liken to a work of art, make the prospect of an extended interpretation of this image appealing. Scholars have taken up the gauntlet. A.M. Dale opts for painting as the referent for ἄγαλμα, although her reason for so choosing between the two arts, that "ἐξαλείφω must mean obliterate, not wipe clean," is not convincing. She translates: "Oh if only I could be expunged like a painted picture and start again with a plainer appearance in place of this beauty."[173] Even more incongruously, Paley suggests "wiped out, obliterated, like a portrait," only later specifying what medium he has in mind, translating: "O that I could be wiped out like a picture, and so again get a plainer form for this fair one."[174] As with Collard's comment about *Hec.* 590, one wonders why a painting might be obliterated, or why the senseless obliteration of a painted scene would be meaningful to the average listener, in short, what real-world activity would the listener associate with such an image. Paley compares Plato, *Theaetetus* 187b, where Socrates invites his interlocutor to "wipe clean" (ἐξαλείψας) their previous conversation about knowledge in order to get a clearer view of where they are at that moment.[175] A better comparandum would be *Republic* 501c, where this language (ἐξαλείφοιεν) is used

[171] Of fr. 618 Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 612, suggests that the Greek painter "did not cover over the stroke that failed to satisfy; he 'wiped off' the paint applied that failed to express his thought."

[172] Cf. Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, p. 162.

[173] Dale, *Euripides Helen*, p. 83; cf. Pearson, *The Helena of Euripides*, pp. 87–88: "a picture," comparing *Ag.* 1329, although he allows for both possibilities.

[174] Paley^2 2, p. 142.

[175] Ibid.

of mistakes being corrected in a painting. However, there is still no sense of complete obliteration; furthermore, in such circumstances, a corrected replacement is immediately forthcoming (τὸ δὲ πάλιν ἐγγρά-φοιεν, ibid.), and this is not what Helen wants. On the other hand, to think of a *sketch* on a whitened board would make a painting/drawing analogy somewhat more plausible, though, to my knowledge, no one has suggested it.[176] A whitened sketchboard would routinely be wiped clean for reuse (e.g., Pl. *R.* 501a: πίνακα … καθαρὰν ποιήσειαν ἄν). Preparatory sketches, however, would not normally be considered beautiful in themselves, certainly not enough to be compared with Helen of Troy.

While there is merit in many of these attempts to clarify Euripides' image, the ideal solution is to think, along with Kannicht and Ewald Kurtz, among others, of a polychromed statue.[177] This, what was once distinctly the minority view in the scholarship, now seems to have become standard, to judge from the passage's appearance in a review of ancient sources for polychromy by Oliver Primavesi in a recent catalog exhibition, *Gods in Color. Painted Sculpture of Classical Antiquity.*[178] The confusion apparently began in antiquity, where the trail of the erroneous use of ἄγαλμα to refer to painting in a couple of ancient sources has been traced by Kannicht.[179] Norman Austin also associates the image with a statue rather than a painting, drawing a connection, as I do, with the *eidôlon* of Helen that assumes prominence in Euripides' play; however,

---

176 Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, p. 188, comes closest, positing a sort of underpainting ("noch feuchter Entwurf") in which corrections can still be made.

177 While my interpretation of *Hel.* 262–263 as a reference to the polychromy of statues was arrived at completely independently, I later learned that this view had been aired by Kannicht, *Euripides Helena*, 2, pp. 89–90, followed by Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 608–609, who expands upon Kannicht and observes, op. cit., p. 608: "Der Vergleich hat eine Einzelheit aus der farbigen Bearbeitung der Plastiken [i.e., plolychromy] zum Gegenstand, die sich in der älteren griechischen Literature bis zum 5. Jahrhundert als Vergleichsthema nur hier belegen läßt, und zeugt vom Interesse des Euripides an Arbeitsvorgängen der darstellenden Kunst." Earlier, Henricus van Herwerden, *Εὐριπίδου Ἑλένη* (Leiden, 1895), ad loc. v. 260, tentatively endorsed this interpretation. Most recently, Allan, *Euripides Helen*, pp. 180–181, having reviewed the arguments for each medium, in the end seems to prefer painting.

178 Oliver Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures in Ancient Literature? The Textual Evidence Revisited," in *Gods in Color. Painted Sculpture of Classical Antiquity*, eds. Vinzenz Brinkmann and Raimund Wünsche (Munich, 2007), pp. 193–209 (194–195), an English version of Primavesi, "Farbige Plastik in der antiken Literatur," in Vinzenz Brinkmann, *Die Polychromie der archaischen und frühklassischen Skulptur* (Munich, 2003), pp. 91–106 (92–93).

179 Kannicht, *Euripides Helena*, 2, p. 90; cf. Xanthakis-Karamanos, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*, pp. 82–83, n. 3; Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," p. 195.

like many commentators on the passage, whether they favor painting or sculpture as the referent, Austin finds himself on uncertain ground when it comes to the technical ramifications of "rubbing away" or "obliterating" a statue.[180] Thus, A.Y. Campbell, who understands "statue ... completely repainted," but explains, somewhat awkwardly, that "Helen feels [that the Greeks] are harsh critics, judging as they do by purely superficial, i.e., adventitious, blemishes, such as were normally removed before an actual statue was placed on view," comparing, not unfairly, Plato, *Republic* 361d, a passage that uses a particularly strong term (ἐκκαθαίρω) to allude to the final polishing of statues.[181] Primavesi's discussion, however, easily settles the practical ramifications of the action suggested by the image; polychromy could be removed from a statue, but the "form" itself would remain. He also points out that Plato (*R.* 420c) uses the opposite compound, ἐναλείφω, to refer to the *application* of paint to the statue,[182] further increasing the likelihood that ἐχαλείφω at *Hel.* 262 refers to its removal.

None of these writers compares the Euripidean image with Archaic korai, which, as the most lavishly painted of all ancient Greek statues, happen to offer a better comparandum than any extant Classical example. (Let me reiterate what I have already proposed, that there is no need to assume that every trace of the korai's existence and all knowledge of Archaic aesthetics were eradicated by the Persians, and that Euripides, born in the 480s, could very well have encountered the Athenian examples early in his life.) Plato's *Republic* 420c–d is regularly cited as a *locus classicus* for the ancient concept of associating polychromy with beauty in statuary, but Plato is concerned with the *appropriate* application of coloring; he nowhere indicates that polychromy is the *only* component of beauty in a statue. Hence, if the paint were removed, the statue would still possess some beauty, as the korai from the acropolis in their present state, with most of their polychromy faded or entirely lost, amply attest. In this state, that is, having been "wiped clean," the statue would be *less* beautiful, even uglier, but by no means ugly.[183] A fifth-century audience thoroughly familiar with the practice of polychromy would retain a

---

[180] Austin, *Helen of Troy*, p. 203, with n. 66.
[181] A.Y. Campbell, *Euripides Helena* (Liverpool, 1950), p. 71.
[182] Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," pp. 194–195.
[183] Cf. Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 609: "Wenn man die Farbe abwischt, erhält die gesamte Gestalt ein häßlicheres Aussehen;" and Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," p. 194: "If an *ágalma* becomes significantly uglier because something was wiped off of it, then whatever was wiped off must have been essential to the original beauty of

mental picture of the "before and after" appearances of the typical white marble statue even if there were no real-life occasion for the *removal* of polychromy, as is likely (though not at all as incongruous as obliterating a painting). Assuming a polychromed statue is the intended referent allows the rest of the language of the passage to fall neatly into line. Helen's use of the comparative, αἴσχιον, but not the superlative, to characterize her wished-for physical condition, is telling. She does not desire to be ugly, just less beautiful, in other words, ordinary.[184] A painting would simply be non-existent if it were "obliterated," whereas a statue would only be less beautiful, more ugly or just "plain," if stripped of its polychromy. This interpretation also makes better sense of the emphatic, somewhat tautological αὖθις πάλιν as a statue returned to its original or pristine state.

Before we leave the *Helen* passage, I offer some final observations in support of the present interpretation. A well-known Aeschylean passage has been mentioned in connection with Helen's wish in Euripides' play, though without elaboration.[185] *Agamemnon* 416 reveals that there were beautiful statues of Helen (εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν, as if statues of Helen could be anything but beautiful!) in Menelaus' palace in Sparta. This exceptional state of affairs is perhaps recalled at *Ag.* 741, when Helen is called an ἄγαλμα πλούτου,[186] which could also pass for a veiled allusion to the palinodic version of the story, the one Euripides' adopts in his play. I wonder whether Euripides, who we know to have been in the habit of emulating his great predecessor, intends an oblique reference to those statues—apparently a whole-cloth invention of Aeschylus'—at *Hel.* 262–263, in deference to Aeschylus. Second, in a play that adopts the palinodic version of the Helen myth and is full of tragicomic elements, there should be plenty of room for an intentional pun or two involving statues; the "wiping clean" reference to the removal of polychromy might incorporate such a pun. Austin's evaluation of *Hel.* 262–263, while I disagree with his interpretation of ἐξαλείφω, is instructive: "Her wish is fraught with

---

the *ágalma*. The only thing that could be so decisive and yet removable would be its coloration." Both of these writers overstate the case somewhat; the stripped statue would still retain a degree of its beauty.

184 My interpretation is somewhat at variance with that of Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," p. 194, who stresses the impossibility of Helen's situation: "The painting of a sculpture is as real as Helen's fatal beauty; likewise, the idea that the coloration, so vital to the beauty of a statue, would ever be wiped off is just as impossible as Helen's liberation from her beauty."

185 Allan, *Euripides Helen*, p. 181.

186 The latter is problematic; see Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 2, pp. 344–345.

irony, since she is indeed a statue, but, unlike other statues, she cannot be rubbed away. Even marble statues could be rubbed away by time or by the reverent hands of many devotees, but Helen saw herself as an idol frozen for eternity in the same perfect condition. A beauty that could be worn away in time would be a blessed relief."[187] Finally, this is not the only instance where Euripides refers to polychromed sculptures; another, fr. 752c (*Hyps.*), will be considered in Chapter 4.

A Crown of Glory

In disavowing her statuesque beauty, Helen acknowledges that the perfected beauty of statues is the standard against which mortal splendor may best be judged by other mortals. Therefore she seeks a way, however implausible in real life, to lessen the statue's dazzle: removing the traces of its final, crowning *kosmêsis*, its polychromy. To consider polychromy the metaphorical "crowning" touch in the creation of a statue is but to acknowledge that crowns, both represented (as at, e.g., *Ion* 1085) and actual (as at, e.g, *Hipp.* 73–87), are a regular feature of Greek statuary. So also the figurative "crowning" of an "agalma" that occurs in the great choral ode on the labors of Heracles at *HF* 348–435, which is regarded by Godfrey Bond as "unparalleled in length and formality among the plays of Euripides."[188] The ode has been called "Pindaric"—and appropriately, since Heracles is ὁ καλλίνικος at *HF* 582—but is delivered by the chorus of Theban elders as a threnody for the hero who is presumed dead, caught in the Underworld in an unsuccessful attempt to retrieve its guardian, Cerberus.[189] While not an ekphrasis in the sense in which this term is most commonly used, since nowhere does Euripides directly state that works of art are its inspiration (Barlow calls it merely a "decorative ode"), nonetheless, the labors are so popular in Greek art of all media, places, and time periods that it is hard to escape the likelihood that art is being evoked even if particular works are not being described.[190] As a further indication that this is so, the fact that Cerberus has only three,

[187] Austin, *Helen of Troy*, p. 203.
[188] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 146.
[189] Bond, ibid.; cf. Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 139, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 84, 86 and 88.
[190] Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 139; neither Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 80 ff., nor Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 146 ff., emphasize the visual properties of the ode to the same degree as Barlow, loc. cit., pp. 139 ff.

rather than fifty, heads, when the hound is mentioned at *HF* 611 (there is no mention of Cerberus in the allusion to the most recent labor in the choral ode under discussion), suggests that Euripides sought guidance on that iconographical feature in visual images rather than the literary tradition (e.g., Hes. *Th.* 310–312).[191] Three heads are typically shown in vase painting out of expediency,[192] but fifty would obviously have been the more dramatic number in literature, where there are no constraints. Hence, one must seek an explanation for why Euripides, faced with the option, settled on the greatly reduced figure. The answer could be that he was inspired by works of art.

It is probably unwise to seek specific works of art as models, although the most well-known representation of the twelve labors in art, the metopes of the Early Classical temple of Zeus at Olympia, present an obvious choice. Commentators Bond and Barlow consider the Olympia metopes to be the most apposite comparandum for the ode. As Bond observes: "This ode and the twelve Olympia metopes are the only extant instances of a series of twelve labours before the third century." Neither, however, is willing to draw explicit connections between the ode and the Olympia sculptures or other fifth-century representations of the labors. Noting disparities between the "canonical" verbal and visual groupings, both Bond and Barlow explain that Euripides was concerned to present Heracles as a pan-Hellenic rather than a Peloponnesian hero.[193] This is certainly a valid point; however, I would add that it would be uncharacteristic of Euripides unequivocally to evoke a particular, readily identifiable monument, especially of such a late date.

Barlow, noting that the ode is characterized as a στεφάνωμα (*HF* 355) by the chorus who offer it as a eulogy of the missing hero, proposes that it "itself is like a crown or garland both in physical shape, like a daisy chain of labours in ring form ... and in the honour it brings ..."[194] The language of the ode is exceptionally ornamental, one might say even painterly, for Euripides, a feature that appears more conspicuous by comparison with the workmanlike language of the later, equally lengthy, messenger speech at vv. 922–1015. There, a different and inglorious Heracles is revealed in an unadorned report on his murderous rampage;

[191] It should be noted that Cerberus is also three-headed at S. *Tr.* 1098, a play whose date is extremely controversial.
[192] Cf. M.L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), p. 253.
[193] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 154–155; Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 139.
[194] Barlow, ibid.

in both language and in sentiment, this account is a counterpoise to the earlier choral passage that had extolled the hero's virtues.[195] Barlow, in making this observation, adds that the point of contrasting the styles of the two passages is "to represent different planes of reality: one remote, romantic, decorative (adjectivally orientated)—the other close, grimly unsentimental, violent (verbally orientated)," and that "it is a measure of how far the hero had to traverse from superhuman victory to human tragedy," something that Heracles the character himself recognizes when he contrasts the two defining events of his life (the labors and the murders of his children) at *HF* 1271–1280.[196]

Barlow, however, fails to notice that the overtly decorative quality of the ode could also signal that works of visual art are being evoked, if not actually described. Ornamental, painterly language is appropriate for an ekphrasis, offering a strong indication that the ode is exactly that. There is no question of the enormous popularity of the labors of Heracles in Greek art from across the media spectrum in the Archaic and Classical periods, a fact that cannot have been lost on the original audience of Euripides' play. No particular example need be considered the model. As the ode got underway and the audience members recognized its subject, collective knowledge that the labors were a subject that enjoyed greater favor among visual artists than in literature[197] would be sufficient to put them in mind of visual artifacts, if not specific works, then of the theme in general as an iconographic staple for artists. In two recent monographs on the myths of Heracles, the authors come to similar conclusions concerning the preeminence of the visual arts in the early mythological tradition of Heracles. Frank Brommer observes of the representations of the hero in art from the eighth, seventh, and sixth-centuries BC: "The early pictures are particularly important, for they trace the legend of Heracles back several centuries before the earliest preserved literature;" while Mark W. Padilla adds: "As a principle … visual material should in some

[195] Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 140; Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 156; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 84.

[196] Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 141.

[197] This will be made clear by comparing the overviews of the labors of Heracles in Greek literature before E. in Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 155, and Rainer Vollkommer, *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece* (Oxford Monograph) 25 (Oxford, 1988), pp. 79–80, with the assemblies of representations of the labors in the visual arts in Vollkommer, op. cit.; Jaimee P. Uhlenbrock, *Herakles. Passage of the Hero Through 1000 Years of Classical Art* (New Rochelle, NY, 1986); Frank Brommer, *Heracles. The Twelve Labors of the Hero in Ancient Art and Literature*. trans. and enlarged by Shirley J. Schwarz (New Rochelle, NY, 1986), all passim, and the complete catalog of *LIMC* 5, pt. 1, s. v. Heracles, pp. 5–111.

instances precede mythical references, and the anomalies of Herakles' biography suggest that he was a common subject of this mythopoeic process."[198]

Brommer's appendix of texts, while not exhaustive, contains the following that are earlier than or roughly contemporary with Euripides' *Heracles* (prod. ca. 416 BC): Hesiod, *Theogony* 313–318 (the Lernian hydra); Pindar, *Olympian* 3. 25–30 (the Ceryneian hind), *Olympian* 10. 27–30 (the Augean stable episode and its aftermath), *Nemean* 1. 61–66 (a general reference to the forthcoming labors), as well as additional individual labors mentioned in fragments; Euripides' own *Alcestis* 481–496 (the horses of Diomedes); Sophocles, *Women of Trachis* 1089–1102 (Nemean lion, Lernian hydra, Erymanthian boar, Cerberus, apples of the Hesperides, and "a myriad other labors").[199] In his review of the labors' early history in literature, Padilla mentions also a *Herakleia* by Peisandrus of Cameirus, a "shadowy" figure of the seventh century, which appears to have featured some labors, and a reference to the Nemean lion episode in Bacchylides 9. 4–9.[200] Padilla further observes: "Only scant evidence indicates that the Greeks conceived of the labors canonically prior to the fifth century;" he cites specifically Pindar fr. 169a (Snell and Maehler), which includes a fragmentary reference to a "twelfth" labor.[201] Excluding vase painting and the minor arts, among the major monuments extant in the Greek world of Euripides' day that depicted the labors of Heracles were: eleven (or twelve) metopes of the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi depicting eight or nine labors, twelve metopes of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, ten east metopes of the Hephaisteion in Athens depicting nine labors.[202]

It seems clear that the original audience of Euripides' *Heracles* would take for granted that the visual arts had pride of place in representations of the labors of Heracles. As the decorative, artificial nature of the language of the ode unfolded, this frame of reference would be reinforced. The visual arts were inherently the more decorative and artificial milieu

---

[198] Brommer, *The Twelve Labors of the Hero*, p. 6; Mark W. Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles in Ancient Greece. Survey and Profile* (Lanham, MD, 1998), p. 4.

[199] Brommer, *The Twelve Labors of the Hero*, pp. 83–88.

[200] Patdilla, *The Myths of Heracles*, p. 7, with n. 56 and p. 14.

[201] Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles*, p. 2, with n. 24; Pi. fr. 169a: op. cit., pp. 39–40, n. 24, with further bibliography, and p. 9.

[202] Respectively: John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture. The Archaic Period* (London, 1991), [hereafter cited as Boardman, *GSA*], fig. 213; Boardman, *GSC*, figs. 22–23; Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 111.

for the depiction of the labors, making all the more likely that the category of imagery summoned before the audience's eye as the song progresses would be works of visual art rather than verbal. Moreover, the use of the terms *agalma* and *agalmata* near the beginning and towards the end of the ode function as signposts indicating that the mimetic medium is being switched from verbal to visual and back again.[203] At *HF* 357–358, just before the description of the first labor, the slaying of the Nemean lion, begins, we have: γενναίων δ' ἀρεταὶ πόνων / τοῖς θανοῦσιν ἄγαλμα ("the excellence of noble toils is an *agalma* for the dead"). That *agalma* is a word for statue as well as simply a "thing of delight" or, better here, "crowning glory," is impossible to ignore. Now both flowery language and visual *mimêmata* of the Heraclean canon of exploits are equally a great delight which, while he is unable to enjoy the present encomium, shall serve in the future as a forceful reminder of his former heroic self to the disgraced Euripidean hero. While both Euripides' ode and actual art works depicting the labors have, by chance, been bequeathed to posterity, of the two, only the visual representations have been bequeathed without the addendum of the maddened rampage that resulted in the virtual annihilation of his family; in that sense, then, the artifacts are (and were in the fifth century subsequent to the production of *HF*) more properly *agalmata*. At *HF* 425 the deeds remaining unaddressed are summarized as δρόμων τ' ἄλλων ἀγάλματ' εὐτυχῆ ("the fortunate measures [*agalmata*] of other contests") just before the fact that Heracles is now dead is reiterated, a signal that the ekphrasis is over, the repertory of the labors has been exhausted, the visual reverie has evaporated, and we are back in the world of the verbal present, with its impending horrors. The chorus thus "crown" with their song the "agalmata" (that is, the labors) of the greatest of Greek heroes, but their στεφάνωμα, though earnestly offered, is doomed to a very short life-span in the Euripidean theater that engendered it.

Three additional points might be made regarding Euripides' references to the labors of Heracles and the visual arts. First, when Megara mentions at *HF* 465–466 that her husband used to throw the skin of the Nemean lion over the heads of his children, the audience would not have to

[203] While it is tempting to regard the entire poem as an *agalma*, in the manner of Pindar, the term is not, as Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 146, seems to suggest, used explicitly of the choral song, but rather on both occasions, of the deeds of Heracles, the ode's subject and inspiration; yet one might legitimately consider these *agalmata* as doing double duty, standing as well as a synonym for στεφάνωμα (v. 355).

imagine how this would have worked from a practical point of view, since generations of artists had already imagined it for them. Ready visual comparanda for how to wear a lion's skin neatly over one's head would have been provided by the countless representations in Greek art, especially vase painting, of Heracles wearing over his own head the physical attribute that is most frequently associated with him, a trophy of his first successful labor.[204] That skin was like a second to him, fitting helmet-like over his head while implausibly allowing his face to protrude through its jaws, with its paws knotted at his chest. Obviously the small heads of children peeping through the jaws would have made them seem at the same time ferocious and vulnerable. It would be almost perverse to believe that these images did not enter into play in *HF*. The lion's skin as an attribute of Heracles or a symbol of Heraclean traits is so omnipresent in representational art, as such famous co-opters of the symbolism as Alexander the Great and Roman emperors such as Commodus recognized,[205] that it has become, for art historians, the primary means by which this hero is identified in works of art in all media, and an especially valuable tool in the case of representations in the minor arts.

Second, the labor involving the man-eating Thracian mares of Diomedes is especially noteworthy because it is recounted in two of Euripides' Heraclean plays, by the chorus after the fact at *HF* 380–386 and in greater detail by Heracles himself before he has undertaken the deed at *Alc.* 481–498. Brommer observes that the passage in *Alcestis* (prod. 438 BC) constitutes the first time in Greek literature that the episode is mentioned, with the exception of Pindar fr. 169a.[206] As Brommer states unequivocally, "Pictorial representations preceded the literary sources." Though he claims that the episode is almost as rare in the visual arts, Brommer offers a rather impressive list of examples, including a few early vase paintings, an extremely fragmentary metope on the Athenian treasury at Delphi, as well as metopes on the Hephaisteion at Athens

[204] For Archaic and Classical examples, see Uhlenbrock, *Passage of the Hero*, pls. 1, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20. Heracles appears with the lion's skin over his head as early as the Archaic limestone "Introduction" pediment from the Athenian acropolis (Boardman, *GSA*, fig. 194). For a brief account of the development of Heracles' image in art, see Brommer, *The Twelve Labors of the Hero*, pp. 65–67.

[205] Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles*, p. 32, with n. 284.

[206] Brommer, *The Twelve Labors of the Hero*, p. 34, with n. 42; see also Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles*, p. 9.

and the temple of Zeus at Olympia.[207] While he does not pursue the implications of this material further nor draw any inferences from it, Brommer's list makes apparent that the episode became more and more popular in the art of the Classical period, which could explain in part Euripides' interest in this particular labor.[208]

Third, at least four sculpted groups from the "floating" Archaic limestone pediments now in the Acropolis Museum in Athens feature Heracles and a snaky, fishy opponent; another pediment has the hero's introduction to Olympus at the right, the birth of Athena (probably with aegis) at left, a Gorgon (probably with snakes) at center, and large coiled snakes in both corners.[209] Though all of these were buried sometime after the Persian sacks of the acropolis in 480/79, evidence that, as arguably in the case of the korai statues, there was a collective memory of the popularity of Heracles in the sculptured pediments associated with an uncertain number of buildings which once stood on the Archaic acropolis may be found at *HF* 1271–1272, where Heracles, recounting his labors in brief, mentions his battle with the "three-bodied Typhon," a labor which, as Bond points out, is "barely mentioned in antiquity."[210] The famous "Bluebeards" pediment, with its mysterious monster consisting of three smiling, bearded human heads and torsos attached to three tightly inter-

[207] Brommer, *The Twelve Labors of the Hero*, pp. 35–36; cf. Vollkommer, *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece*, pp. 11–12; *LIMC* 5, pt. 1, s. v. Heracles, pp. 67–71.

[208] There would seem to be no compelling reason other than dramatic purpose, which we need not enter into here, for E. to choose the horses of Diomedes labor as the occasion for Heracles' arrival in Thessaly, unless geography was the sole motivation; since the *Alc.* passage is the earliest extant extended reference to the labor, we have no way of knowing if the chronology of the transmitted myth required it. Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles*, p. 30, notes a certain flexibility in the evidence on the locations of the labors, which possibly is owed to different areas of the Greek world vying for an association with the hero.

[209] Triton (twice), the Hydra, and Typhon [?] (Boardman, *GSA*, pp. 153–155 and figs. 192–197). The arrangements of the extant pieces, which belong to which pediment, and even the number of pediments and the number of temples that they might have decorated, are all still debated. For a convenient recent summary of the evidence for the temples on the Archaic acropolis and the many problems it presents, see Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, pp. 105–121. For a recent review of the literature on the popularity of Heracles as a subject in Greek art of the sixth and fifth centuries, including an extended discussion of John Boardman's influential but still contended thesis concerning the Peisistratids' identification with the hero, see Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles*, pp. 10–13.

[210] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 384, with n. 2.

twined snaky bodies in the right corner, and Heracles fighting the Triton in the left, especially comes to mind.[211] Both Bond and Willamowitz felt free to associate this passage with the "Bluebeards" pediment, although it should be noted that the identification of the creature as Typhon is by no means certain.[212]

The Wooden Horse

Ancient *agalmata* incorporated both beauty and sublimity, and beauty, oftentimes by virtue of sublimity—so in life as throughout Euripidean drama, as we have seen again and again. Our final sculptural subject is featured, not as a stage prop, but nonetheless as a functioning image in a single play, *Trojan Women*. The Trojan horse, an object whose beauty is unknowable but which is forever intertwined with its *terribilitá*, might also be thought of, in some sense, as an *agalma*—although there was little left of "delight" by the time it had fulfilled its treacherous purpose. That the horse is presented as a kind of perverse cult object is underscored by the fact that Euripides uses synonyms of *agalma* to describe it. The chorus of *Trojan Women*, in a recollection of the sack of Troy, characterize their first impressions of the wooden behemoth left behind by the departing Greeks. In a mistake whose consequences would be as colossal as the vessel of death and destruction in front of them, they had hailed it as a ἱερὸν ξόανον (*Tr.* 525); it turned out to be an oxymoronic ὀλέθριον βρέτας (*Tr.* 12).[213] The physical appearance and the history of this terrible object are fleshed out more fully at *Tr.* 9–14, 519–521, and 533–539.

The most telling of these verses, *Tr.* 13–14, are suspected by many as an interpolation, an issue which must be addressed before we proceed: ὅθεν πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ὑστέρων κεκλήσεται / δούρειος ἵππος, κρυπτὸν ἀμπισχὼν δόρυ ("Whence it shall be called the 'wooden horse' by later men, since it harbored a hidden 'spear' [that is, an army]"). Lee rejects the lines as an actor's interpolation, while Barlow suspects that they may be "an explanatory note by an earlier interpreter of the play," and Biehl follows suit. John R. Wilson argues that they do not match the usual pattern of

---

[211] Acr. Mus. 35 (Boardman, *GSA*, figs. 192–193).

[212] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 384–385; Wilamowitz-Moehllendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 258; Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, p. 114, and Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, pp. 108–109, summarize the many identifications which have been proposed.

[213] I follow Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4, in printing the βρέτας of ms. V; Diggle prints βάρος.

etymologies in Euripides.[214] Diggle brackets the lines, as does Kovacs, who explains that they "make a poor pun on δούρειος ἵππος, which usually means 'wooden horse' but is treated as if it meant 'horse of spears.'"[215] I cannot agree that it is a "poor pun;" on the contrary, it is more than a little clever, as I hope to show, and neither atypical nor unworthy of Euripides. To reject the lines for reasons based primarily on subjective judgments about their quality is simply not compelling. Moreover, Euripides is fond of what Barrett aptly prefers to call "name-αἴτια"[216] rather than etymologies proper; these lines would fall neatly into that category, as shall be made clear as my argument unfolds. In addition I hope to demonstrate how other language and imagery in the play backs up the sentiments of the suspected lines in such subtle ways as to render the reverse unlikely, that this other language inspired the interpolation. In sum, with the caveat that many editors and commentators have found *Tr.* 13–14 problematic enough to dismiss as the work of Euripides, I remain unconvinced that that they are anything other than authentic, and go forward on this basis.

One group of scholars has for the most part embraced the authenticity of *Tr.* 13–14: archaeologists. The lines, along with *Tr.* 519–521, have been associated with a colossal bronze sculpture of the Trojan horse by the sculptor Strongylion, whose career probably spanned the late fifth and early fourth centuries BC.[217] The statue was erected on the acropolis of Athens in the later fifth century. Pausanias (1. 23. 8) describes it in some detail, but does not give the name of its sculptor:[218]

> There is the horse called Wooden set up *in bronze* [my emphasis] (ἵππος δὲ ὁ καλούμενος Δούριος ἀνάκειται χαλκοῦς). That the work of Epeius was a contrivance to make a breach in the Trojan wall is known to everybody

[214] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 68; Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 159; Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p, 103; John R. Wilson, "The Etymology in Euripides, *Troades*, 13–14," *American Journal of Philology* 89 (1968), pp. 66–71.

[215] Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4, p. 15, n. 3.

[216] Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 161, in reference to an example in *Hipp.* 32–33, comparing also *IT* 1456–1461, *Hel.* 1674, and *HF* 1329.

[217] Léon Parmentier, "Notes sur les *Troyennes* d'Euripide," *Revue des Études Grecques* 36 (1923), 46–61 (46–49); Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 165, mentions "a huge bronze statue of the Wooden Horse on the Acropolis" but rejects the lines; cf. Paley^2 1, p. 478: "Of such allusion however there is little probability." Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 386, includes *Tr.* 519–521 but not 13–14 among the passages that refer to Strongylion's statue. The literary sources for Strongylion have been conveniently collected by Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 71–73.

[218] Cf. Hsch., s. v. δούριος ἵππος (Δ 2262–2290 Latte): Ἀθήνησιν ἐν ἀκροπόλει χαλκοῦς ἐστιν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκκύπτουσι δ'.

> who does not attribute utter silliness to the Phrygians. But legend says of that horse that it contained the most valiant of the Greeks, and the design of the bronze figure fits in well with this story. Menestheus and Teucer are peeping out of it, and so are the sons of Theseus.[219]

Only its base, discovered in the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia during the excavations of the acropolis in 1840, is preserved. It carries an inscription that records the name of the dedicant Chaeredemos, son of Euangelos of Koile, and the sculptor Strongylion; its letter forms allow the inscription to be dated to the last decades of the fifth century.[220] A scholiast to Aristophanes' *Birds* 1128 concluded that ἵππων ὑπόντων μέγαθος ὅσον ὁ δούριος refers to this statue rather than the original Trojan horse;[221] the scholion goes on to quote the first part of the extant inscription with the name of the dedicant, although it too leaves out that of the sculptor. The date of production of *Birds* (414 BC) provides a *TAQ* for Strongylion's sculpture, allowing for the possibility that *Trojan Women* (produced in 415) and the statue are very nearly exact contemporaries.[222] That possibility turns into a likelihood if *Tr.* 13–14 are regarded as a direct allusion to the "Wooden Horse" of Strongylion, as I believe they are. If so, the reference in Aristophanes' play, close on the heels of that in *Trojan Women*, suggests that the statue was a novelty in Athens at this date.[223] Its size and its location at the southwest corner of the acropolis would have made the newly dedicated statue visible to members of the audience in the theater of Dionysos in 415 BC.

---

[219] Trans. Jones, *Pausanias Description of Greece*, 1.

[220] Acr. Mus. 13264; Em. Loewy, *Inschriften Griechischer Bildhauer. Greek Inscriptions Recording Names and Works of Ancient Sculptors* (1885; repr. Chicago, IL, 1976), #52; *IG* I^3 895. For discussion and illustrations, see F.W. Hamdorf, "Zur Weihung des Chairedemos auf der Akropolis von Athen," in *ΣΤΗΛΗ. ΤΟΜΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΜΝΗΜΗΝ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΟΝΤΟΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ*, ed. Nikolaos Kontoleon (Athens, 1980), pp. 231–235; Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 229, with fig. 168. Ridgway, *Fifth Century Styles*, p. 122, observes: "The sides of its large marble base on the Akropolis show traces of the wheels, which clearly characterized [Strongylion's] horse as a contraption and may have given Pausanias the idea that it was in fact a siege engine (1. 23. 8)." Parmentier, "Notes sur les *Troyennes*," p. 48, argues that the reference to the Trojan horse at *Tr.* 516 (τετραβάμονος … ἀπήνας) indicates that Strongylion's horse was equipped with wheels.

[221] As Dunbar, *Aristophanes Birds*, p. 596, deduces, noting that: "The epic form δουρ- (cf. Homeric δουράτεος, *Od.* 8. 493, 512) suggests that ὁ δούρ(ε)ιος ἵππος had become a proper name." Cf. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 385–386.

[222] Cf. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 386; for the date of *Av.*, see Dunbar, *Aristophanes Birds*, p. 1.

[223] Cf. Parmentier, "Notes sur les *Troyennes*," pp. 47–48.

As a mimetic object already twice removed from reality, not to mention its ontological distance in both scale[224] and material from the real-life "model," the Trojan horse, a bronze replica of a wooden representation of a horse that was known only from literature offered the playwright an enigma whose verbal mimetic potential he was apparently unable to resist.[225] In what ways the original resembled a real horse we can never know; we may safely leave aside the question of the equine nature of Strongylion's image, which, while we are told that he was something of a specialist in cows and horses (Paus. 9. 30. 1), was an illusionistic imitation of another image, not of a horse, in essence, a colossal *trompe-l'oeil*. At stake and on display in the statue, and, consequently, in its verbal evocation, is the contingency that bronze and wood by nature have nothing in common as media for sculpture. The challenge to the maker and the secret of the artistry of the piece resided in the ability of the sculptor to render a convincing imitation of a material of vastly different qualities than the one in which he was working while at the same exploiting and preserving evidence of the properties of the actual, as opposed to the imi-

---

[224] Estimations of the size of Strongylion's horse vary: "nearly six meters high," according to Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 229, based on an earlier estimate; cf. Hamdorf, "Zur Weihung des Chairedemos," p. 231: "5–6 m hoch"; Gorham Phillips Stevens, *The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens* (Cambridge, MA, 1936), p. 19: "The top of the head of the horse must have reached to a height of about 5.75 m. above the base." Hamdorf, op. cit., p. 233, does not give the dimensions of the base, with the exception of the height of the doubled blocks, some 44 cm; his pl. 67a gives a good sense of actual scale. Carol Mattusch, *Greek Bronze Statuary From the Beginnings through the Fifth Century B. C.* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1988), p. 193, with n. 45, may be the most credible, as she clearly explains her deductions from a base that she says measures 1.74 by 5.08 m: "The base would have carried a horse that was between 70 and 80 percent of its length, or about 3. 8 meters long from point of shoulder to buttocks. To judge from the proportions of other fifth-century horses, this one could have stood up to 3. 5 meters high at the withers and probably over 4. 5 meters to the top of the head." If her calculations are correct, the image would have been colossal but still not equivalent in size and capacity to the original, as far as it may be imagined, which is said to have carried within its belly an untold number of Greek soldiers; for a review of the ancient accounts of the number, which range between twelve and one-hundred, see Anderson, *The Fall of Troy*, p. 22, n. 12. Anderson, op. cit., pp. 22–23, compares the horse of Epeios to a ship, in size, scale, design, and, most importantly, concept. For ancient Near Eastern sources for tales about large quantities of soldiers smuggled into cities under seige, see Christopher A. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses. Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual* (New York and Oxford, 1992), p. 96.

[225] Parmentier, "Notes sur les *Troyennes*," pp. 48–49, also emphasizes the contemporary fascination with this aspect of Strongylion's sculpture; he points to Pausanias' (10. 9. 12) reference to an apparent copy by Antiphanes of Argos sent to Delphi by the Argives as a thank-offering for a military triumph over the Lacedaemonians in 414 BC (Th. 6. 95).

tated, medium. This feat would amount to a delicate balancing act for any artist, ancient or modern. Too convincing an imitation would obviate the artistry behind the illusion, since the statue would then pass for wood, rather than a bronze imitation of wood. In other words its bronzeness would have to be affirmed in discreet ways in order for this particular mimetic act to set itself apart from less complex mimetic acts that are merely once removed from the original model; therein, surely, lay the appeal of Strongylion's horse to an ancient Greek audience, who were intrigued by illusionistic paradoxes.[226]

In many ways *Tr.* 13–14 can be said to perform a comparably sophisticated illusionist feat. It is no coincidence that these "men of later times" call the Trojan horse "δούρειος ἵππος," the same appellation used of Strongylion's statue, as if it were its proper name, by both Aristophanes and Pausanias; therefore, we may assume that the lines are intended to evoke the recently erected statue. The lines, then, would offer a coy explanation for how Strongylion's statue, which was not wooden, but bronze, acquired its name, in other words, how a bronze statue would come by the proper name, "Wooden" (the enigma of Pausanias' ἵππος δὲ ὁ καλούμενος Δούριος ἀνάκειται χαλκοῦς): It is not called δούρειος because it appears to have been made of wood, but because it concealed the Greek army (δόρυ).[227] In this way, those who recognized the allusion to Strongylion's statue and were aware that it was made of bronze would have to smile at Euripides' attempt to bypass that fact, to play along, as it were, with Strongylion's illusion, as if it were absolute. Adding yet another dimension to the verbal mimicry, the locution "hidden spear" (κρυπτὸν δόρυ) used of the enclosed army to pun on δόρυ/δούρειος could also contain an allusion to the material of the "imitation" of the horse, bronze, since spear-heads are made of bronze, the very same material that is, in effect, "hidden" by Strongylion's illusionistic artistry.

As for those traces of the statue's bronzeness left hiding in plain sight, Euripides may offer a few clues. *Tr.* 519–521 provides the information, ostensibly of the original horse, that the image had gilded tack: ὅτ' ἔλιπον ἵππον οὐράνια / βρέμοντα χρυσεοφάλαρον ἔνο- / πλον ἐν πύλαις Ἀχαιοί ("When the Achaians left behind at the gates the towering

[226] For a similar paradox, cf. the life-size marble basket, from the Roman period, in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (MMA 37. 129; illustr. Carlos A. Picón, et at., *Art of the Classical World in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* [New Haven and London, 2007], fig. 422).
[227] Cf. Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 103 (ad *Tr.* 11).

horse, glistening with trappings of gold, murmuring with armed men"). I propose that the original audience hearing these lines would have envisioned Strongylion's bronze rather than the historical wooden horse, which is less likely, it would seem, to have had golden equipage, although there is no way of confirming this.[228] Moreover, the term χρυσεοφάλαρος is a *hapax*.[229] It is doubtful whether a completely new descriptive epithet of the Trojan horse could have earned legitimacy at this late date *unless* it were inspired by a fresh development in the history of the idea of the horse, which is exactly what Strongylion's new sculpted rendition represented in the later fifth century BC. Thus, we may conclude that the bronze horse was outfitted with at least some gold tack.

Another clue is provided by a hypallage at *Tr.* 534 that has perplexed many commentators: πεύκᾳ ἐν οὐρεΐᾳ ξεστὸν λόχον Ἀργείων ("a polished band of Argives in a mountainy pine"). Lee, whose text I adopt, appears to find the hypallage somewhat too "bold" but concedes that the text is sound. However, he is one of the few to print the πεύκᾳ ἐν οὐρεΐᾳ of the manuscripts; the more commonly printed πεύκαν οὐρεΐαν (*sic*, Diggle) is an emendation of Dobree that allows for it to be read in apposition to ξεστὸν λόχον, an apparent concession for those who are confused by the image. Kurtz has no problem with printing the dative, noting the metonymy, or with the image, drawing our attention to the fact that not once in the entire sentence is the word ἵππος mentioned.[230] There is no need for it. Lee proposes yet another intriguing ramification, that λόχον, as well as meaning "group of men in ambush," contains also "a hint at the sense 'childbirth,'" which he then connects with the image ἐγκύμον' ἵππον τευχέων at *Tr.* 11.[231]

---

[228] Cf. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 386; Parmentier, "Notes sur les *Troyennes*," p. 48: "... nul doute que ces détails ne correspondent à l'aspect véritable de la statue de l'Acropole." *Pace* Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 165, who mentions Strongylion's statue in connection with *Tr.* 13–14 but ultimately rejects those lines as spurious, and does not associate this passage with the statue, suggesting instead: "Since the Horse was supposedly an offering to Pallas, the Greeks have dressed it in appropriate finery." Cf. Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 185, who sees "something malignant and sinister" in the reference to gold attachments, and refers to the "false allure of gold objects in this play." She, too, does not associate the passage with Strongylion's horse but with the original.

[229] *TLG*, s. v.; an alternate spelling χρυσοφάλαρος is attested, but not in poetry.

[230] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 353.

[231] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, pp. 167–168, with relevant bibliography on the difficulties presented by the image.

While there are additional possibilities for interpretation, the bottom line is that these verses are meant to refer *both* to the recently completed original horse *and* its hidden band of warriors, an image, in its way, comparable to the κοῖλον λόχον of *Od.* 4. 277, updated with a contemporary allusion to specific features of Strongylion's visionary new creation.[232] The Euripidean image is invested with a number of implications: First, the adjective "polished" might more aptly be used of a bronze statue than a wooden one.[233] True, the epithet ξεστός is used of the wooden horse at *Od.* 4. 272 and in close proximity to κοῖλον λόχον used of the whole contraption at v. 277, but Euripides is not Homer, even though he may be invoking him; furthermore, Euripides' image is far too unusual to be regarded merely as a Homericism. In adding the third frame of reference, Euripides has trumped Homer. For I propose that the image had the effect of coercing the audience into thinking of Strongylion's version even as they "saw" the historical horse, imagining it to be as highly burnished as the one standing resplendent almost directly behind them, and divulging that that image was polished to a high gleam or perhaps even gilded. Second, Pausanias' description makes clear that Strongylion's statue featured representations, either embossed in the bronze or inlaid with contrasting metals, likely, of individualized Greek warriors peering out from within the body of the animal.[234] With these in mind, Euripides' "polished band" would then constitute a perfectly literal, if somewhat playfully arcane, way to allude to this sculpted group; it would make little sense as a characterization of the real group of men in the original Trojan horse. Third, the language of *Tr.* 534, interpreted in this way, encapsulates the enigma of a bronze replica of a wooden image by alluding to the bronzeness of the embossed warriors but at the same time acquiescing to

---

[232] *Od.* 4. 277 (less so, 8. 515), while less striking an image than E.'s, also succeeds in eliding the differences between the men and, in Homer's case, the interior rather than the exterior of the horse.

[233] *Pace* Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 167; Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 230; Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 185, who see no incongruity in associating it with πεύκᾳ (or πεύκαν; see above).

[234] Regarding Pausanias' description, cf. the mid-seventh-century BC pithos in the Mykonos Museum (Robertson, *History of Greek Art*, pl. 5b), with a relief decoration on its neck that shows the Trojan horse with its hidden band of soldiers rendered as if they were passengers on a bus, in a series of large profile heads framed by port-hole sized openings that run along the flank and right up the neck of a rather too slender horse, which, as depicted, would never be able to accommodate the remainder of their bodies.

the sculptor's illusionistic "portrayal" of wood by falling back on a more customary way of referring to the horse, "mountainy pine." This reading of *Tr.* 534 would serve the double purpose of extending the reach of its poetry much further into typically Euripidean imagistic territory and minimizing the discomfort that some have felt in the face of its curious language.

Conclusion

Euripides, the statue-evoking poet, is, like Strongylion, the sculptor of a bronze that passes for wood, a champion of *apatê*. In deploying language and imagery related to statuary, the playwright has, like the sculptor, succeeded in his self-appointed task of mimicking the mimicked. This is poetry about stone (and about wood, and bronze, and gold, and, on one occasion, Helen's *eidôlon*, a more ethereal substance), a composite expressive idiom which offers a unique perspective on the *ut pictura poesis* debate. In antiquity statuary-inflected language is directly answered by statues that are themselves scripted, that is, provided with a dialogue often complete with meter and verse (I am thinking primarily of the funerary epigram). When an inscribed statue accosts the passerby and demands its measure to be taken as both word and image, the two communicative functions, reading/speaking/singing and looking, coalesce. The word is in its way petrified, made permanent, by being inscribed; its music, unable to flee, is fixed for all time. Likewise for Euripides, merely to speak of stone (and of bronze and wood, but especially stone) seemingly makes the poetry itself more solid and durable, as if transforming it into a kind of metaphor for a scripted work of plastic art. The disparate realms of speaking and silence, of word and image, merge in a perfect vehicle for the communication of perpetuity, immorality, and artistry. In spite of its apparent solidity, however, this composite vehicle is, like the "wooden" horse, but another colossal deception.

The world of art is, in the final analysis, a world of the *nous*, of the imagination, a world whose price of entry is a temporary suspension of normal, rational, human instincts by normal, rational, human beings. Dante acknowledges that the *nous* is the lifeline of any work of art when he refers in the opening stanza of "The Divine Comedy" to the poem itself as a *concetto*, the same word that Michelangelo, whether by coincidence or design, uses for the statues that he "finds" in marble blocks, a theory that is outlined in the abstract in the sonnets, while an actual

plan for producing a carved slave goes undescribed.[235] In the rarified intellectual universes of societies like Classical Greece and Renaissance Italy, where all aspects of life are examined, both words and statues are ultimately residents of the mind. A famous exchange of epigrams between Giovanni di Carlo Strozzi and Michelangelo, recorded by Vasari, is instructive of this. The figure of "Night" had, in 1545, just been installed in the Medici Chapel, Florence. Each put words into the mouth of the lifelike marble statue. Aiming to flatter and to imply that he understood the sculptor's intentions, Strozzi's "Night" had this to say: "Night, that you see in such sweet repose / Sleeping, was sculpted by an angel / In this stone, and since she sleeps, she lives; / Wake her, if you don't believe it, and she will speak to you." To which Michelangelo's "Night," who knew the truth, replied: "Sleep is dear to me and even more so being made of stone, / As long as injury and shamefulness endure; / Not to see, not to hear is my good fortune; / Therefore do not wake me, lower your voice."[236] To script a statue in this way represents an affirmation both of the illusionistic skills of its creator and of the potential power of the spoken word to disrupt and ultimately destroy the illusion, an easy task, since it resides in the mind. This is why ancient "speaking" statues invite the viewer to linger and contemplate but not to touch, for touching would confirm the difference between reality and art, a difference the artifact, whether verbal or visual, must preserve in order to justify its existence.

The natural silence of statuary is thus transgressed in the hands of Euripides, a master of the music of language, which is, as Michelangelo suspected, oftentimes discordant. But the final word in this chapter properly belongs with Niobe, a woman who seemed destined to be consigned to endless, silent, and insensate weeping in her petrified condition. This was not, however, to be the case, for her story found resonance with visual artists and tragedians alike, guaranteeing that the woman would not be permitted to commit her anguish to a painless void. Her real-life body having been transformed into naturalized rock by Leto and Apollo, Niobe is brought to life, as it were, once again, by the sculptor in, of all materials, stone. The irony did not escape the notice of an anonymous late epigrammist (*APl* 16, 129) who saw Niobe in one of her many

[235] Dante, *Inferno*, Canto 32. 4; Michelangelo, "Non ha l'ottimo artista alcun concetto," v. 1 (James M. Saslow, *The Poetry of Michelangelo* [New Haven and London, 1991], pp. 302–303).

[236] Trans. Julia C. and Peter Bondanella, *Giorgio Vasari. The Lives of the Artists* (Oxford and New York, 1998), pp. 456–457.

reconstituted forms, a sculpture by a great master of the fourth-century BC: "From a living being the gods made me stone, but from stone, Praxiteles restored me to life again." In successfully mimicking the mimicked, the sculptor embraces a perfomative act with bravura, only to be one-upped by the playwright: In *Andromache*, Niobe is propelled back into her mortal state, a state which, through the gradual onset of petrifaction, she had been misled into believing she would never revisit, as she is metamorphosed once more into a living, breathing, sobbing, mass of suffering female humanity in the form of a doppelgänger, Hector's inconsolable widow.

CHAPTER THREE

PAINTING

Introduction

Technical advances in the visual arts were a routine occurrence over the course of the fifth century after the Persian wars, a period which encompasses the lifetime of Euripides.[1] These advances came steadily and in rapid sequence, with each new development rendering obsolete all previous notions about representation, bringing the art of painterly mimesis to the very threshold, or so it must have seemed, of nature itself. Whereas the developmental history of Greek sculpture may be said to peak just after the mid-fifth century with the invention of the Polykleitan canon, developments in painting gain momentum in the second half of the century, leading to the great flowering of the fourth century.[2] Such is the fountainhead of all histories of western art. However, for the present purposes, we must not underestimate the *cultural* and *intellectual* weight of the momentous changes brought about by these artists, and their potential to captivate, to challenge and, occasionally, to offend, an engaged, inquisitive general populace of the period in question, which included Euripides. The methodical transformation of a two-dimensional surface into a unified pictorial field of vision, or, to put it differently, the replication of optic reality through a series of calculated

---

[1] Portions of this chapter have appeared in two earlier articles by the author, "Euripides, Monumental Painting, and the Portrayal of Space in the Fifth Century BCE," *Word & Image* 23 (2007), 45–58 and "Coins and Character in Euripides," in *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*, J.R.C. Cousland and J.R. Hume, eds. (Leiden and Boston, 2009), pp. 255–272.

[2] Still the best account of the development of illustionistic painting in Classical Greece is Vincent J. Bruno, *Form and Color in Greek Painting* (New York, 1977). As the evidence is almost exclusively literary, philologists who have taken an interest have made impressive contributions to our knowledge of the subject. The provocative work of Eva C. Keuls ("Skiagraphia Once Again," *American Journal of Archaeology* 79 [1975], 1–16; republished in *Painter and Poet*, pp. 107–144) on the problems associated with *skiagraphia*, remains essential. More recently, Stephen Halliwell (references below) has brought his expertise in Plato to the fray. The debates continue.

falsifications—in short, what I will call "the painting of space"—stands as one of the most radical visions ever entertained, and it had a long shelf-life. As a sign of the weight and authority of that unprecedented achievement, its equally methodical, even reverential, dismantling at the hands of Picasso and Braque and their followers and successors in the early twentieth-century constitutes one of the greatest acts of homage in history.

The fact that we in the western tradition take the western notion of painted space for granted must not allow us to forget that it did not have to happen, that there was none of the inevitability about space getting painted that there might have been, say, about the human form getting sculpted. For some three thousand years, advanced civilizations in the Near East and in Egypt did not attempt the feat on any systematic level; nonetheless, information was conveyed in two-dimensional visual arts in an effective and aesthetically satisfying manner. To set out to represent space would seem to be a perverse, almost irrational endeavor, uncharacteristic of the "rational" Greeks. It is as if these ancient artists somehow anticipated photography and set out step by step to match its capabilities before it could arrive to trumpet the futility of their long quest. Moreover, even photography did not annihilate the Classical Greek legacy single-handedly; it has taken more than one broad-based cultural phenomenon to topple western painting from its position of supremacy. Against all predictions, however, neither photography nor its own challengers, including Cubism and abstraction, have managed to render the centuries-old relationship between artist and two-dimensional surface completely obsolete; to this day treating the picture plane like a window onto the visible world has artistic viability. This is in part because the pioneering achievement of the painting of space during the fifth and fourth centuries BC represents much more than a landmark artistic accomplishment; the fact that Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and their respective ken were keenly interested in its progress qualifies it as a triumph of the intellect, as well.[3]

---

[3] *Pace* Jeremy Tanner, "Culture, Social Structure and the Status of Visual Artists in Classical Greece," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Sociey* 45 (1999), 136–175 (esp. 149–154), who in general takes a rather dim view of the notion of artists as intellectuals and rejects any connections between art theory and philosophy until quite late, though still within range of the lifetime of Euripides: "Only at the very end of the fifth century and in the fourth century, did the opportunities for a radical reorganization of the relationship between visual art, élite intellectual culture and society—which had been opened up by Polykleitos on the limited level of design—begin to be exploited (p. 151)."

Which begins to explain why, throughout Classical antiquity, writers, poets, and thinkers were in the habit of looking to the visual arts to find ways to present and clarify various ethical and philosophical questions that modern life posed and modern literature dramatized. (Or was it the other way around, that the questions arose in response to techniques and practices in the arts?) The methods and means by which the visual arts were produced and the habits and thought processes of the craftsmen that produced them offered a large body of immediate, accessible source material for those engaged in the verbal disciplines. It is not surprising that the most directly mimetic of the fine arts were put to the service of representing ideas. This is especially true of the art of painting. Testimony is provided by the wealth of anecdotal material about the visual arts that is preserved from antiquity, only a relatively small portion of which can be said to have come from professional historians of art and even less from the artisans themselves. Euripides, I hope to show, also contributes to this rather motley record, but, since his contributions are incorporated into poetry, they are more difficult of access. The enterprise, however, is not without justification. There is a degree of illogicality in the fact that authors such as Pliny, Pausanias, Diodorus, and Strabo are routinely cited for their historical authority on Classical art, even though they are separated by centuries from the material remains for which we cite them, while the poets and playwrights who were eyewitnesses, including Euripides, are largely disregarded. Euripides himself is a special case; if the biographical record that he was once a painter is to be believed, there is every reason to suppose that he kept himself informed of contemporary developments in the profession.

Even if there is no truth at all in the biographical record, there are still compelling grounds to believe that Euripides, a well-known intellectual, maintained an interest in the visual arts, perhaps with a special attention to painting, if for no other reason than that his peers apparently did. The lifestyle of Socrates, who, in the accounts of contemporaries, visited artists' studios and frequently appealed to the visual arts in his arguments (and who similarly was said to have had a craftsman's background) may be regarded as representative of the cultural elite of Euripides' generation, and as such offers a window onto the playwright's lifestyle about which much less is known. However, the best evidence that Euripides conformed to this model is found in the plays themselves, in the language, imagery, and phraseology that betray a familiarity with contemporary developments in two-dimensional art media, especially monumental painting. This chapter is devoted primarily to monumental or "free"

painting rather than vase painting because, with a few exceptions, I am more interested in language and imagery that imply direct knowledge of artisanal practices than in coincidences of iconography or narrative per se, where vases are particularly useful, an area of study that has already been well-served by students of Euripides' relationship with the visual arts.[4] Another issue that I shall not address, and which may have little to do with Euripides anyway, is the vexed question of a correlation between the new developments in perspective by the painter Agatharchos (of unknown date) and *skenographia* on the Classical stage, a subject of ongoing debate that is not of immediate relevance to the present project.[5] Nor is true linear perspective, which neither Greek nor Roman designers achieved, essential to the western notion of painted space, for space may fairly be said to be represented on any occasion in which there is successful deployment of the great hoax that permits two-dimensional shapes to be read as volumetric forms which actually occupy it.

Any obliquely-positioned figure has the effect of deepening the illusionistic "space" of a two-dimensional work of art by at least what we see or understand to be the length of the prone body in question. Illusionistic space can be deepened still further by other means at the artist's disposal or it can be abruptly terminated, according to the artistic effect desired. This space created by the artist, which is unique to each monument and internally logical only to that monument (although a single artist may consistently choose to treat space in a certain characteristic way), may be manipulated: It may be expanded or contracted, made believable or unbelievable, to conform to natural appearances or not to conform, subject to the whims and ways of artifice. Even an abstract painting can be made to seem to have depth. However, no work of figural art in what has come to be called the classical tradition can ever be truly planar, as an abstract painting is planar. Thus, no matter how shallow the real or the illusionistic space is in a Greek or Roman work of art, or how pla-

---

[4] For a sampling, see Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 20, 31, 37, 40, 58, 142–143, n. 69, and 156, n. 34, and, in general, the scholarly work of T.H. Carpenter, Oliver Taplin, H.A. Shapiro, and the pioneer in this sub-field of classical studies, T.B.L. Webster. See also pp. ix–x, above.

[5] A convenient collection of the major ancient sources for Agatharchos may be found in Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 145–146; for analyses of the evidence and the issues it raises, see, e.g., Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, pp. 36–43; Padel, "Making Space Speak," pp. 346–354; and, in defense of ancient vanishing-point perspective, Jesper Christensen, "Vindicating Vitruvius on the Subject of Perspective," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 119 (1999), 161–166.

nar, relatively speaking, the effect of that work is or appears to be, some degree of spatial depth must be taken for granted. In art and in life, a person takes up space, and people are most often the subjects in classical styles of art. People can be decorative, if they are purposefully and systematically reduced to simple, two-dimensional shapes as they are on Geometric vases. Classical art is never decorative in this sense; therefore, we may conclude that every work of figural art has some "space." In this sense, Raphael's "School of Athens," with its cavernous illusionistic classical architecture, and Chardin's late still lifes, in which a tableau of humble objects is pushed nearly to the "edge" of the picture plane, each on its own terms puts the western notion of painted space on virtuoso display.

There are many ways in which words and word patterns are able to mimic the mimetic properties of painting, in other words, for writing to seem to be "painterly."[6] For a verbal artist one of the surest signs is the exploitation of color, in all of its senses, including the literal (the hues of the spectrum as conveyed to the human eye by the visible environment), the so-called "local" variety (incidental details that help to establish the "flavor" of a specific locale), and "color" used in an abstract sense to express a conjunction of linguistic qualities such as vividness, variety, and full-bodied character as an overall stylistic trait. Color, in the last sense, is more a province of Aeschylus than either Sophocles or Euripides, if the standard of comparison is with modern orchestral "color," most closely associated with the music of Richard Wagner, which is replete with layer upon layer of suggestive imagery, as is Aeschylus' poetry. Color in Euripides, though perhaps less compelling a topic, nonetheless has generated significant scholarly attention, especially in German language publications concerned with the playwright's imagery, to which the interested reader is referred.[7] Adding intrigue, David Sansone has recently argued that Socrates' "tragic" (τραγική) definition of color, put forward in Plato's *Meno* 76d–e, derives from a theory that found expression somewhere in the work of Euripides; hence, the curious appellation.[8] Generally speaking, for the present purposes, the primary function of color in Euripides is pragmatic in that chromatically inflected words are more often than not

---

[6] Cf. Barlow's "pictorial style" (*The Imagery of Euripides*, p. vii), or better, Kurtz' translation, "malerischer Stil" (*Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 23).

[7] See pp. xiv–xv.

[8] David Sansone, "Socrates' 'Tragic' Definition of Color (Pl. *Meno* 76D–E)," *Classical Philology* 91 (1996) 339–345.

put to the purposes of description. These occasions nonetheless represent fully poetic experiments, often inspired, in the formidable linguistic assignment, which apparently challenged even Homer, of putting a name to a rarified hue, in other words, finding the word or words that will effectively summon the intended coloristic effect before the mind's eye.[9]

Ample evidence of Euripides' pragmatic approach to color is supplied by Barlow's list of "compounds of light and color appearing for the first time in Euripides," impressive for its length. Barlow also observes how extensively Euripides' color language and his approach to the verbal representation of color is indebted to Lyric poetry and especially to Pindar (e.g., *O.* 6. 39–41), from whom the playwright borrowed many compound adjectives that "expressed most strongly the sensuous qualities of objects, their color, or the light reflected from their surfaces." True to form, however, Euripides, does not forage in this tradition indiscriminately; instead, according to Barlow, he "rearranges what he inherits as common stock of the lyric tradition, and invents, by analogy with the old, new decorative compounds, using them to pinpoint aspects of landscape and scene hitherto unnoticed or differently described."[10] Bond goes further, connecting the proliferation of colors "in the εἰδύλλια [short, highly wrought descriptive passages] of Euripides' later choral odes" with the anecdote that he was originally a painter.[11] Walther Kranz has also associated the εἰδύλλια with pictures, in his case, on vases.[12]

As an indication that the pictorial tendencies of Euripides' style were recognized early, Barlow notes that "one of Euripides' imitators," Philostratos, by his own account, acknowledges that some of his own *Imagines* are based on Euripides' messenger speeches; she cites as an example *Im.* 2. 23. 2, on an image of the madness of Heracles.[13] What is it about the speeches that might have inspired Philostratos' ekphraseis? Barlow usefully summarizes the distinguishing features of Euripidean messenger speeches, which she considers "factual landscapes." Her remarks are worth quoting in full:

---

[9] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 73, adds: "Taking Euripides' narrative speeches as a whole, there are few purely ornamental adjectives, and few details of scenic description which are not germane in some way to the event itself."

[10] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 8–10, and 134, n. 30 (the list).

[11] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 156, commenting on *HF* 361–362, with examples.

[12] Walther Kranz, *Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin, 1933), pp. 242–244.

[13] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 68, with n. 33, where she refers to Fairbanks' *LCL* edition, p. 233, n. 1.

> ... there is a consistent pictorial presentation in these, which builds up from a quiet setting at the beginning to the violent climax of action in the later part. Although such visual conceptions do not depend upon imagery of a metaphorical kind, occasional similes or short metaphors contribute sharpness to this pictorial narrative without in any way disturbing the predominant style. In fact by increasing the visual precision, they continue it. The similes themselves contain description of the same kind as that which is outside them and the metaphors do not carry one off into abstract realms of ideas where the visual is not important, but require imagination with the eyes alone. They are concerned like the rest of the speech with *how* an action happened, not why.[14]

To follow Barlow, in these speeches all detail is subordinated to, and put to the service of, persuading the audience to visualize the central event or events, in other words, to assist the mind's eye in a graphic reconstruction of offstage action that is crucial to the plot of the play. This is reinforced by Euripides' idiosyncratic use of an epic device, a verb of perception in the second person (e.g., ἂν εἶδες ["you would have seen"], *Andr.* 1135), a direct address to the audience so as "to involve the listener in the narrative," according to Lloyd, who adds that the device appears "only in messenger speeches of E."[15] Narrative is more naturally the domain of words; thus the invitation to picture a narrative is gratuitous on the part of the playwright and can be seen as a characteristic of his style, not to mention a sign of his interest in painting. Barlow attempts to account for why messenger speeches in particular would require such a high degree of pictorializing detail. The messenger, in Barlow's view, is an "outsider" and thus "it is as a detached observer that he reports what he sees, as he comes upon it as it were cold, or by chance." The "pictorial language" of the speeches, she continues, is, accordingly, "suited to what is demanded of an eye-witness account of a crime, poetically conceived in the narrative mode." Of the language of messenger speeches, by comparison with the narratological mode of choral passages, Barlow makes an interesting analogy: "Stylistically it bears the same relation to lyric imagery as a black and white etching to a painting."[16] If I understand her correctly, the "etching" (the messenger's recounting of the action for

---

[14] For a full discussion of the pictorial qualities of the Euripidean messenger speech, see Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 61–78; quotation is from p. 109.

[15] Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 158; cf. Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 231.

[16] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 61, with n. 3: "Contrast Sophocles' practice with messenger-type characters in the *El.* and *Trach.*, or the highly subjective style of the Guard in the *Antig.*" Irene J.F. de Jong, *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden, 1991), pp. 63–116, challenges the assumption

the audience who have not seen it happen) reproduces the events but leaves out the "color," which is left to the lyric passages to provide; hence the proliferation of color-words in choral utterances. In enlisting the services of both verbal modes, each with its special attributes, Euripides achieves his desired goal of overall pictorial realism.

A painterly impulse can also be detected in the expressive use of the language of gesture, which, in an art form that is condemned to a "majestic silence" (a wonderful translation by R. Hackforth of σεμνῶς πάνυ σιγᾷ at Pl. *Phdr.* 275d),[17] is often the sole means available for conveying the meaning, content, and emotional tenor of a scene and of advancing a narrative. Sculpture (here I mean sculpture-in-the-round), to judge from what we can see, depended less for its effects on gesture than did painting, where narrative is primary. When gesture is used expressively in tragedy, it may be considered painterly.[18] The painterly in art is not confined to painting, but is the proper domain of any primarily two-dimensional medium, including vases and relief. For an example, a number of Euripidean images appear to reprise the private world newly glimpsed in late Classical Athenian grave reliefs, iconography which is also reflected on white-ground funerary vases, both genres contemporaneous with Euripides. After a long hiatus, the impetus of which is still debated, production of elaborate gravestones resumes in Athens about 430 BC, in a completely new form that bears no resemblance to the kouroi and relief stelai that were dominant before the hiatus began.[19] Multi-figured relief compositions within shallow arched niches

---

that the Euripidean messenger is an objective reporter; however, her discussion of the vividness of pictorial imagery ("scenery") in E.'s messenger speeches (op. cit., pp. 148–160) nonetheless lends support to Barlow's premise.

[17] In Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, eds., *The Collected Dialogues of Plato Including the Letters* (Bollingen Series) 71 (Princeton, 1963), p. 521.

[18] Thus, Steiner, *Images in Mind*, p. 52, invites us to imagine the actor playing Hecuba at *Hec.* 807–808 (a passage discussed below), as the queen entreats Agamemnon to pity her suffering self, "striking a particularly piteous *schêma* here, perhaps one borrowed from the painter's repertoire."

[19] The bibliography on the resumption of grave monuments in the later fifth century is vast; for a thoughtful recent reconsideration, see Karen Stears, "The times they are a'changing: Developments in fifth-century funerary sculpture," in *The Epigraphy of Death. Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, ed. G.J. Oliver (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 25–58. A useful overview, with bibliography, of the problems connected with the major ancient source for the phenomenon, the so-called "post aliquanto" funerary legislation described by Cicero, is found in Andrew R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2004), pp. 414–424.

replace portraits of the deceased in the round and on stelai, allowing for a much broader range of funerary iconography to be displayed, along with auxiliary effects more common to the art of painting.

Perhaps Euripides was moved by the remarkably personal new subject matter in these reliefs and took inspiration from them in minor-key tableaus such as at *Supp.* 772, when Adrastos expresses a wish to be permitted to "lift up my hand" to greet the dead in a traditional gesture of mourning and farewell, an echo of the iconography of, for instance, Athens NM 715, from ca. 430.[20] Medea at *Med.* 901–902, in a speech to the children that she is plotting to kill, a half-hearted attempt to deceive them into believing that all is well between their parents, wistfully imagines for them a pictorial tableau that will not take place: the children, after having lived a long life, "stretching out a beloved arm"—a clear reference to what a child would normally be expected to do at a parent's funeral, but something these particular children will never do. Grave reliefs such as Athens NM 2894 come to mind.[21] Why assume that works of visual art, rather than real-life experiences inspired such moments in the theater? Because both are mimetic art forms, counterfeits of reality in different ways. In the case of the reliefs, there is more here than simple one-to-one correspondence; since motion and sound, among other essential ingredients, are absent, art must find a *language* of gesture that somehow "reads" as equivalent to the real thing. So in the case of the theater, while sound and motion may be mimicked, what is missing is real grief—which the tombstone has. As if one mimetic art is nodding to the other, I submit that the gestures gracefully enacted on the stage at *Supp.* 772 and *Med.* 901–902, among others, would inevitably put the audience in mind of the quietly moving new way of portraying death and its consequences in two-dimensional art.

Landscape in Phaethon*'s "Dawn-song"*

Evidence of "the painterly" in literature is also seen in the kinds of details that are closely identified with the *paintable*. If narrative is the natural domain of words, what we call "imagery" in literature (i.e., the

[20] Illustr. in Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 148, who suggests, however, that the youth, who holds a bird in his left hand, is extending his right towards a "lantern or birdcage."

[21] Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 156.

use of language to elicit a sensual response, usually, but not exclusively, visual) falls more naturally within the domain of painting. Images must be coaxed in literature, in what is in essence an act of solicitation, whereas they are the sum and substance of representational painting. Moreover, the degree of success of word images is measurable only in the mind's eye, since there are no external tests like those regularly adduced for painting itself, such as birds pecking at painted grapes. A primary locus for imagery in literature is landscape. Barlow, to no surprise, devotes a substantial portion of her book, *The Imagery of Euripides*, to the topic,[22] though Euripides is hardly unique in devoting attention to landscape imagery. Ekphrases of fictional landscapes, whose ancestry goes back to the νῆσος ἔπειτα λάχεια that inaugurates the description of the island of the Cyclopes at *Odyssey* 9. 116–151 (cf. 10. 87–94, on the harbor of the Laestrygonians), sound painterly to the ear not solely because in the western tradition we associate landscape with a genre of painting. Whether visual or verbal (or later, aural; think of Beethoven's Pastoral Symphony and its progeny), landscape is experienced and makes its mark on the memory primarily through visual sensations. Anthony Wagener also makes a connection between the two art forms, although he does not grant precedence to either: "There is an evident analogy between … passages descriptive of natural surroundings as they are employed in narrative poetry and the landscape background in painting."[23]

Landscape is portrayed in Greek art as far back as the middle Bronze age; oral poetry likely reaches back that far as well. Hence it would be hazardous to assign a direct line of influence between the two art forms, which I neither mean nor need to do. At any rate the ultimate source for both is arguably nature, even though many if not most painted or poetic landscapes are fantasies. The representation of nature inherently requires looking, matching, and verification before the imagination comes into play. My point is simply that landscape description is more naturally painterly, and it remains painterly when verbalized. So with Euripides, as commentators have implicitly agreed, in evocations of landscape the playwright's language takes on a painterly cast. The difficulties with drawing analogies between Euripides' plays and fifth-century painting are compounded by a scant archaeological record whose deficiencies have made identifying a landscape sensibility in Greek art before the Hellenis-

[22] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 17–78.
[23] Wagener, "Stylistic Qualities of the Apostrophe to Nature," p. 92.

tic period an elusive proposition. For in large part Classical Greek painting is lost to us. Our knowledge of Greek monumental painting depends upon indirect sources including literary descriptions, reflections in contemporary vase painting, and later Roman copies or versions of Greek originals. In lieu of evidence questions of how Greek painters treated the landscape settings of their mythological works or whether they concerned themselves with landscape at all must be left open. However, it is possible to make some informed guesses. To judge from the prominent role of landscape in Euripides, and because landscape is inherently painterly, though risking a circular argument, I strongly suspect there was an equally substantial interest in landscape among the artists. How might its absence among painters be explained when a landscape sensibility is amply in evidence among the poets from Homer onwards, and landscape is the most painterly of subjects? Even if landscape paintings did survive, there is the further complication of what criteria might be used to distinguish the influence of represented landscapes from that of real-life landscapes in literary descriptions. With an array of cautionary measures in place, let us investigate how contemporary painting might have influenced Euripides' landscape imagery.

Euripides was a keen describer of landscapes, as Barlow and others have demonstrated. At this time we shall focus our attention on one of his most refined and extended landscape descriptions, the ekphrasis on the arrival of dawn from the parodos of the fragmentary *Phaethon* (prod. ca. 420 BC.[24]), a minor masterpiece that is frequently compared with painted landscape in the scholarly literature. The entering chorus of palace servant-girls feel compelled to take notice of the habitual to-and-fro activities of others on a day which will be far from ordinary for them, for they are to assist in the marriage of Phaethon and a goddess.[25] Since I could hardly improve upon it, I reproduce E.S. Barlow's translation of the

[24] For a consideration of the evidence for the date, see Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, pp. 47–49.

[25] The identity of the goddess remains speculative; Aphrodite has proved to be the most resilient candidate, based upon an episode in Hes. *Th.*; however, Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, pp. 155–160, after an exhaustive analysis of the text and secondary literature, concludes that it must be one of the Heliades, sisters of Phaethon; cf. Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 198. More recently, however, Gloria Ferrari, *Alcman and the Cosmos of Sparta* (Chicago and London, 2008), pp. 60–63, reviews the evidence and rules again in favor of Aphrodite. A comparable impression of the hustle and bustle of daily life at dawn, in this case, in the far more spectacular landscape of the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi is given by the opening of *Ion*.

"dawn-song" (fr. 773. 19–42), which, as Collard notes, "on its discovery fired Goethe's enthusiasm and the sensibilities of the later Romantics":[26]

> But now appears the dawn
> New risen and guides her car
> Across the land, and high above my head
> The Pleiad wanes, night's star.
> And now among the trees
> At dawn the nightingale
> Pours from the branches forth her tender strain,
> Her never ending wail,
> Crying for Itys, Itys, yet again.
>
> And dwellers on the mountains
> That drive their flocks to feed
> Lift up their pipes to play them,
> And many a chestnut steed
> With his yoke-fellow by him
> Awakes to crop the mead.
> And they that hunt wild creatures in their lair,
> These too are there
> And to their task betake them with the day;
> While now by Ocean's springs
> Loud toned the wild swan sings
> Her clear sweet lay.
>
> Small boats put on the seas
> Sped by their oars, blown on by favouring gales;
> While sailors cry out as they raise their sails,
> 'Bring us back, gracious breeze,
> With no cruel waves attending,
> Back, while the winds abate,
> To where our children and our dear wives wait,
> Back to our journey's ending.'
> And the blown canvas rests against the forestay bending.

The content and the complexion of the ode beg to be associated with one or more important developments in the art of landscape painting. Webster rightly calls the ode "one of the most remarkable instances of [the] feeling for nature" characteristic of the later fifth century and draws a loose connection with the imagery on a number of contemporary vases. He additionally associates it with the so-called "city-reliefs" found on tomb monuments from Lycia, which also display a remarkable interest

[26] The quotation is from Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 226. The translation appears in T.B.L. Webster, *Greek Art and Literature 530–400 B. C.* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 164–165, attributed to E.S. Barlow, without further information on the source.

in topographical detail, although the reliefs are usually dated to the early fourth century, too late for Euripides' *Phaethon*.[27] Yet neither of these categories of imagery begins to capture the remarkable sensitivity for the minutiae of landscape expressed in this ode. On the other hand a source in wall painting, if one could be identified, would be more apt. In a recent edition of the play Collard notes the coincidence of similarities between "many of the activities in Eur.'s word-landscape" and "the landscape-frescoes said [by Pliny] to have been invented by the Augustan painter Studius."[28] Certainly, upon first acquaintance, as Collard surmises, rather than reflecting the art of its own day, the genre character of the dawn-song appears to prefigure a type of peopled architectural Roman landscape that was, according to Pliny (35. 116–117), the innovation of a certain "Studius" (some mss. have "Ludius"), who, we are told, practiced "during the age of Augustus," but who is otherwise unknown:[29]

> ... [Studius] who introduced a delightful style of decorating walls with representations of villas, harbours, landscape gardens, sacred groves, woods, hills, fishponds, straits, streams and shores, any scene in short that took the fancy. In these he introduced figures of people on foot, or in boats, and on land of people coming up to the country-houses either on donkeys or in carriages, besides figures of fishers and fowlers, or of hunters or even of vintagers. ... He also brought in the fashion of painting seaside towns on the walls of open galleries ...[30]

Period first-century BC examples have been identified in the Villa Farnesina and in the red and black rooms of the Villa of Agrippa Posthumous at Boscotrecase, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; together these paintings feature virtually all of the categories of imagery that Pliny describes.[31] His attribution of the introduction of a

---

[27] Webster, *Greek Art and Literature*, pp. 164–166; the Lycian imagery is dependent upon earlier Neo-Assyrian palace reliefs and looks forward to Roman historical relief; the standard source is Childs, *The City-Reliefs of Lycia*, who prefers a date "in the first half of the fourth century" (p. 16).

[28] Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 227, who points as well to an elaborate painting of a genre scene at the Bosporus described at great length by Philostratus (*Im.* 1. 12–13) that is "comparable in some details" to the *Phaethon* imagery.

[29] On Studius, see Roger Ling, "Studius and the Beginnings of Roman Landscape Painting," *Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977), pp. 1–16; on the issues surrounding the name and a floruit for the artist of ca. 45 BC to AD 20, see Ling, op. cit., p. 2.

[30] Trans. K. Jex-Blake, with commentary and historical introduction by E. Sellers, *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art* (1967; repr. with prefaces and select bibliography by Raymond V. Schoder, Chicago, IL, 1976) [hereafter cited as Jex-Blake/Sellers], pp. 147 and 149.

[31] Roger Ling, *Roman Painting* (Cambridge, Eng., 1991), pp. 142–146, with figs. 151–153.

purely decorative genre of landscape to a Roman painter rather than a Greek is not surprising. The notion of "any scene that took the fancy" as being appropriate subject matter for monumental painting would not have occurred to a fifth-century Greek, and there is indeed nothing to suggest that landscape painting of the purely decorative sort was practiced in Classical Greece.

But Vitruvius, writing during the Augustan period, claims that painters were producing landscapes well before his own day (ab antiquis … antiqui, 7. 5. 1). He is quite specific about distinguishing at least two distinct types of earlier landscape painting (7. 5. 2):

> … in covered promenades, because of the length of the walls, they used for ornament the varieties of landscape gardening, finding subjects in the characteristics of particular places; for they paint harbours, headlands, shores, rivers, springs, straits, temples, groves, hills, cattle, shepherds. In places, some have also the anatomy of statues, the images of the gods, or the representations of legends; further, the battles of Troy and the wanderings of Ulysses over the countryside with other subjects taken in like manner from Nature.[32]

Here Vitruvius appears interested in pointing out that, while landscape paintings of all sorts are indeed the appropriate decoration for long, narrow corridors, some landscape-based themes make good "pictures" and others, good "prospects." Those whose subjects are taken from "the characteristics of particular places" will be good prospects, that is, they will provide an appealing, if illusionistic, "view" onto the world outside as a form of visual relief in what would otherwise be a long stretch of sunless interior space. These landscapes would have a purely decorative function. On the other hand, the ones painted in what might be called the grand manner, that is, those pictures with historical and mythological subjects which would require landscape backdrops, are pictures, rather than *trompe-l'oeil* illusions, as Vitruvius, in making a distinction, seems to imply, yet even the latter are "taken in like manner from nature" (quae sunt eorum similibus rationibus ab rerum natura procreata). This last fact is important to Vitruvius because he wants to establish precedents of good painting against which to contrast, unfavorably, the painting of his own day with its preferences for grotesqueries and implausible architectural fantasies.

Vitruvius' comments are assumed to refer to Second Style Pompeiian painting. However, discussion of the passage has introduced two aspects

[32] Text and trans., Granger, *Vitruvius on Architecture*, 2.

of the landscape question that will help us to understand the genre as it might have been practiced in Euripides' day: (1) that landscape was a featured subject in painting earlier than Pliny's claims for Studius might suggest, and (2) that certain mythological or tragic subjects, such as "the battles of Troy and the wanderings of Ulysses over the countryside," might involve the inclusion of landscape details which would be "taken from nature." On reflection the comparison of the *Phaethon* ode with the work of Studius turns out to be only superficial. Pliny's description does not, in the end, come close to matching the lofty tone of the dawn-song, whose imagery cannot be considered merely decorative, as was apparently the case with Studius'. When regarded in the light of subsequent developments in the play, there is little that is trivial or fortuitous about the vignettes that the chorus single out for characterization in the dawn-song; taken alone each image turns out to be significant; taken together, they are vital for creating a mood that will serve as a foil for the tragedy to come, the fiery chariot crash.[33] With this in mind it is well to look more closely at the evidence for fifth-century painting for possible signs of what might be called meaningful genre-type details.

According to an often quoted anecdote of Pliny (35. 65–66) Parrhasios, evidently a younger contemporary of Euripides (X. *Mem*. 3. 10. 1–5 records an encounter in his studio with Socrates), and Zeuxis, a somewhat younger artist, engaged each other in a contest of *trompe-l'oeil* illusionism with paintings of grapes and a linen curtain, respectively.[34] Pliny follows up this story with another attesting to the experimental atmosphere that accompanied the progress of Classical illusionistic painting. In this case Zeuxis painted a boy carrying grapes in which the grapes were painted successfully enough to fool birds who flew down to settle on them, but the boy, apparently, was not, for if he were painted more

---

[33] For detailed analyses of the imagery of the dawn-song, see the commentaries of Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, pp. 95–116; and especially Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, pp. 226–229, both with further bibliography; see also Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 23–24; Ferrari, *Alcman*, pp. 56–58.

[34] The chronology of Greek monumental painting after Polygnotus is problematic, as the sources are inconsistent. I follow Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, pp. 411–414, in assigning Apollodorus, Parrhasios, and Zeuxis, with their corresponding innovations, to the period encompassing the late-fifth to early-fourth centuries, with Apollodorus the oldest of the three. This would put them within striking distance of the career of E. Zeuxis, as Robertson, op. cit., p. 411, with sources in n. 136, notes, is introduced as a young man in works of Plato and Xenophon set in the late 420s, and a painting of his puts in an appearance in Ar. *Ach*. 991 (prod. 425 BC), according to a scholion. Quintilian 12. 10. 4 has Zeuxis and Parrhasios both working at the time of the Peloponnesian War.

successfully he should have scared the birds away. The chronology is problematic, as is often the case with Pliny, but we should at least assume that these anecdotes reflect painterly concerns of the late-fifth to early-fourth centuries BC. Presumably these paintings were nothing more than frivolous trifles, but they represent minor triumphs on the road to the mastery of illusionism at a time when the complete conquest of illusionism was still for the taking. Pliny's anecdotes testify that, even if they were technical display pieces, paintings with genre-type subjects did exist, and that there was an appreciative audience for these things, even if they were intended primarily to impress other artists. Two genre paintings found their way into a major exhibition space in ancient Athens. Pausanias (1. 22. 7) noticed among the mythological and historical paintings that he viewed in the picture gallery of the Propylaea on the Athenian acropolis "the boy carrying the water-jars and the wrestler" by Timaenetus, a painter otherwise unknown. He skips over them quickly, however, perhaps because of their humble subject matter, whereas he dwells at greater length on the other works.

For evidence of mythological and tragic paintings dating from Euripides' lifetime which would fit Vitruvius' prescription for subjects with enough landscape imagery to make them suitable for long corridors, we need look no further than to the most important and influential painter of the Classical period, Polygnotus of Thasos (fl. ca. 475–450 BC).[35] Most of his subjects, known only from literary sources, would fall into this category. The most famous are the "Ilioupersis" and the "Nekyia" in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi, lavishly described by Pausanias (10. 25. 1–31.12).[36] Pausanias' description of the tumultuous confusion of suffering multitudes in the two great paintings in the Knidian Lesche uncannily prefigures some of the imagery of Dante's "Inferno" and the "Last Judgment" of Michelangelo. Throughout the Polygnotan murals numerous genre vignettes were incorporated into the pictorial landscape settings which both of their subjects required. In the "Ilioupersis" the departure of the Greek ships was enlivened throughout by meaningful genre details, according to Pausanias (10. 25. 2–3):

---

[35] For the floruit and the primary ancient sources for Polygnotus, see Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 126–141.

[36] For a recent attempt to reconstruct the appearances of these paintings, see Mark D. Stansbury-O'Donnell, *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art* (Cambridge, Eng., 1999), pp. 178–187.

> On the ship of Menelaus they are preparing to put to sea. The ship is painted with children among the grown-up sailors; amidships is Phrontis the steersman holding two boat-hooks. … and beneath him is one Ithaemenes carrying clothes, and Echoeax is going down the gangway, carrying a bronze urn. Polites, Strophius and Alphius are pulling down the hut of Menelaus, which is not far from the ship. Another hut is being pulled down by Amphialus, at whose feet is seated a boy.[37]

Throughout his descriptions of Polygnotus' paintings, Pausanias seeks literary sources for the imagery chosen by the painter, demonstrating, among other things, just how habitual was the comparison of painting and poetry. All of the figures were labeled; Pausanias' (10. 25. 3) reference to "a certain (τις) Ithaemenes" implies that he did not recognize the character as having played a role in the Ilioupersis as it was described by the poets. This is confirmed when he adds: "There is no inscription on the boy, and Phrontis is the only one with a beard. His too is the only name that Polygnotus took from the *Odyssey*; the names of the others he invented, I think, himself." Apparently Polygnotus sought to add local color to his depiction by inventing a cast of supernumerary participants. Further genre details were included in this Ilioupersis: "There is also a horse, in the attitude of one about to roll in the dust. Right up to the horse there is a beach with what appear to be pebbles, but beyond the horse the sea-scene breaks off" (10. 25. 11). And (10. 26. 9) "next to Laodice is a stone stand with a bronze washing-basin upon it. Medusa is sitting on the ground, holding the stand in both hands. … Beside Medusa is a shaved old woman or eunuch, holding on the knees a naked child. It is represented as holding its hand before its eyes in terror." While further on (10. 27. 4) "Servants are lading an ass with a chest and other furniture. There is also sitting on the ass a small child."

The "Nekyia" offered even more opportunities for genre and landscape vignettes (10. 28. 1–3): "There is water like a river, clearly intended for Acheron, with reeds growing in it; the forms of the fishes appear so dim that you will take them to be shadows rather than fish. On the river is a boat, with the ferryman at the oars." We are told that Charon is depicted "as a man well stricken in years." Supernumeraries are used in this painting as well, for "those on board [Charon's boat] are not altogether distinguished (οὐκ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐς ἅπαν)." And (10. 29. 1): "Higher up … are Perimedes and Eurylochus, the companions of Odysseus, carrying

---

[37] Text and trans., Jones, *Pausanias Description of Greece*, 4, from which also the following passages from Bks. 9–10.

victims for sacrifice; these are black rams. After them is a man seated, said by the inscription to be Ocnus (*Sloth*). He is depicted as plaiting a cord, and by him stands a she-ass, eating up the cord as quickly as it is plaited." To tell adequately the story of Odysseus' descent into the Underworld necessitated of Polygnotus the inclusion of additional genre details, which Pausanias faithfully records. We need not review all of them. Nearing the end of his description of the "Nekyia" Pausanias describes this vignette (10. 31. 11): "There is also in the painting a jar, and an old man, with a boy and two women. One of these, who is young, is under the rock; the other is beside the old man and of a like age to his. The others are carrying water, but you will guess that the old woman's water-jar is broken. All that remains of the water in the shard she is pouring out again into the jar." Pausanias attempts to attach a symbolic significance to the scene: "We inferred that these people too were of those who had held of no account the rites at Eleusis." The little group is a perfect example of the meaningful genre detail of which both paintings are full.

Polygnotus also did a painting of Odysseus' slaughter of the suitors, seen by Pausanias in the Temple of Athena Areia at Plataea (9. 4. 1–2). In the Stoa Poikile in Athens he produced a scene in another, collaborative, "Ilioupersis" which included a group of Trojan women who were individualized enough for the features of Cimon's sister, Elpinicê, to be identified in a figure that was labeled as Laodicê.[38] A series of paintings depicting various episodes from the Trojan war and its aftermath which Pausanias (1. 22. 6) saw in the picture gallery of the Propylaea may or may not be by Polygnotus; Pausanias' description is unclear about how many of these paintings were, in fact, his, although he is the only artist mentioned, and whether or not the paintings by Polygnotus that are mentioned are even in the Pinakothêkê. However, the descriptions are worth considering:

> On the left of the gateway is a building with pictures. Among those not effaced by time I found Diomedes taking the Athena from Troy, and Odysseus in Lemnos taking away the bow of Philoctetes. There in the pictures is Orestes killing Aegisthus, and Pylades killing the sons of Nauplius who had come to bring Aegisthus succour. And there is Polyxena about to be sacrificed near the grave of Achilles. Homer did well in passing by this barbarous act. I think too that he showed poetic insight in making Achilles capture Scyros, differing entirely from those who say that Achilles

[38] The anecdote is related by Plu. *Cim.* 4. 5; on the works in the Stoa Poikile, see Paus. 1. 15. 1.

> lived in Scyros with the maidens, as Polygnotus has represented in his picture. He also painted Odysseus coming upon the women washing clothes with Nausicaa at the river, just like the description in Homer.[39]

While Pausanias does not describe these paintings any further, we cannot know whether they contained the same wealth of genre detail that we hear about in the two masterpieces at Delphi. But it seems safe to conclude that any one of these stories would require a certain degree of realistic landscape backdrop, we should likely imagine, complete with at least a sprinkling of supernumeraries and meaningful genre details.

In the end Polygnotus' grandiose subjects and his ability to depict human *êthos* (Arist. *Po.* 1450a25–29, *Pol.* 1340a35–38), to be discussed shortly, may have overshadowed the fact that genre details and naturalistic landscape were something of a specialty of one of the greatest painters of the Classical period. He is said to have painted the dog that was led into the battle of Marathon by an Athenian in the mural in the Stoa Poikile, a painting which, like the others in this building, was apparently a collaborative work by several artists, including Polygnotus, Mikon, and Panainos, the brother of Pheidias.[40] Polygnotus was also reputed to have painted a wild hare so lifelike that the phrase Πολυγνώτου λαγώς ("hare of Polygnotus") became proverbial for accuracy (ἀκριβῶς) of depiction;[41] for an idea of what this might have looked like, think of Dürer's famous watercolor drawing of a hare in the Albertina in Vienna. Polygnotus' search for verisimilitude could occasionally land him in trouble; his misguided addition of lashes to the lower eyelids of a horse was ridiculed for its inaccuracy precisely because he had a reputation for letting no detail escape his attention.[42] Moreover, three high Classical vase painters signed their name "Polygnotus" in apparent emulation of the mural painter, and their work and that of their followers often shows a predilection for the indication of landscape, to the limited extent that landscape can be depicted on vases.[43] Through the works produced by this group of vase painters, some critics have adduced something of the effect of the paintings of Polygnotus. The two best-known examples of

---

[39] Trans. Jones, *Pausanias Description of Greece*, 1.

[40] Ael. *NA* 7. 38, who cautions that the dog may have been the work of either Mikon or Polygnotus. Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 141–145, conveniently collects the sources for the paintings in the Stoa Poikile.

[41] *Mantissae Proverbiorum*, 66 (Leutsch and Schneidewin).

[42] Tzetzes *Chil.* 12. 427. 560–565; this horse is said to have been in the Stoa Poikile.

[43] Susan B. Matheson, *Polygnotos and Vase Painting in Classical Athens* (Madison, WI, 1995), pp. 3–4 and passim.

vases which are thought to reflect the Polygnotan manner are the name-piece of the Niobid Painter in the Louvre (Louvre G 431), a calyx crater showing the slaughter of the Niobids and another, unidentified subject, and the pelike by the Lykaon Painter in Boston (MFA 34.79), illustrating the descent of Odysseus into the Underworld, both of which feature uneven ground lines suggestive of a rocky landscape which occasionally hide the lower extremities of bodies.[44] This may sound like meager evidence, but the device has no precedents in vase painting, and therefore is likely to reflect an attempt to imitate one of the popular methods of landscape depiction used in monumental painting.

This kind of evidence suggests that the landscape sung in the parodos of *Phaethon* found its counterpart among the diverse painting styles of the period, most especially in the art of Polygnotus. The landscape sensibility bountifully in evidence in the dawn-song could be interpreted as a response to a famous Classical wall painter's interest in the supernumerary details of landscape backdrops which, by their very ordinariness, would render in high relief the extraordinariness of the major events being enacted therein. For both in art and in literature, genre details are reserved for the margins, but even at the margins, they serve to frame the main event; simply by being commonplace they comment upon the uncommon, and in that way can be seen to carry significance. It is not incidental that the dawn-song reads like an ekphrasis; as such, it could as easily be a description of a portion of a painting as of a real-life scene. Perhaps the ambiguity is intentional. The tradition of imaginative engagement with fictive landscape begins with Homer, as does the conflation of real and represented in a verbal description of a scene. Whether the landscape described in the dawn-song is real or painted, the reader/listener is encouraged to believe that he or she is an eyewitness to the nondescript activities of "not altogether distinguished" individuals, and that a real landscape is being described even if a painted view is what has inspired the ekphrasis in the first place. Or the reverse may be true, and a landscape is being painted before our ears. For a reader/listener to be willing to be absorbed into its fictions, for a poetic landscape to convince the reader/listener to engage imaginatively with the forthcoming drama, nature may first have to be pictured.

[44] Respectively, Boardman, *ARVC*, fig. 4 and fig. 150.

Polyxena, Again

A work of Polygnotus could also be reflected in a Euripidean image discussed in the previous chapter, to which we now return. This is the description of the prelude to the sacrifice of Polyxena at *Hec.* 560–561, where the Trojan girl is compared to ἀγάλματος κάλλιστα as she rips open her dress down to the waist to expose her breasts and falls to the ground on one knee. The image is usually taken to refer to a statue and indeed the word ἄγαλμα is used far more often of statues than of other types of images. On that assumption, we considered several contemporary sculptures that might have inspired the simile. While none represents Polyxena at the moment of her sacrifice, the statues do share with Euripides' poetry an aesthetic of transforming female suffering into a beautified spectacle, which in itself could have prompted the comparison. However, to adopt a different tack, let us now consider what evidence there is of visual representations of the sacrifice scene, itself.

The sacrifice of Polyxena is common neither in vase painting nor in sculpture, and, when it is shown, the iconography of the scene differs from that of Euripides. This is easy to understand; the vase painter was constrained by his medium to choose the most representative moment of the drama, and that would be the sacrifice, itself, whereas the poet enjoyed the luxury of time, of describing the sequence of events at greater leisure. In the best known example, a black-figure "Tyrrhenian" amphora of ca. 560 BC, made specifically for the Etruscan market (London, BM 97.7–27.2), Polyxena is shown near or over the tumulus of Achilles stretched out horizontally in the hands of the Greek soldiers as she is being stabbed in the neck by Neoptolemus, who has her roughly by the hair; streams of blood rush from her wound.[45] The rarity of the scene on vases is implicit in Thomas H. Carpenter's remark that vases of the Tyrrhenian group "include some particularly brutal scenes that would have appealed to Etruscan rather than Attic tastes."[46] An even rarer, sculpted example can be seen on the aforementioned, newly published, Polyxena sacrcophagus from Gümüsçay, Turkey, which has been assigned to the late sixth century BC. There the tumulus is behind Neoptolemus, but Polyxena is still depicted stretched out in the hands of the

---

[45] Boardman, *ABFV*, fig. 57.

[46] Thomas H. Carpenter, *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece* (London and New York, 1991), ad fig. 23.

Greeks and being stabbed in the neck by Achilles' son; the blood was probably added in paint.[47] In neither case is the girl nude to the waist.

However, it is possible that, at a moment of supreme drama, Euripides intended his audience to think of a painted rather than a sculpted ἄγαλμα. This would make sense: Monumental painting, as opposed to vase painting or sculpture, on account of its scale and greater scope of available technical effects, more nearly approximates drama in permitting a more expansive unfolding of a narrative. Monumental paintings of the sacrifice of Polyxena did exist in the Classical period and almost certainly would have been known to Euripides. A late epigrammist at *APl.* 16. 150 attributes a "picture" (πίναξ) of the about-to-be-sacrificed Polyxena to the famous fifth-century *sculptor*, Polykleitos, probably a slip for the painter, Polygnotus, although his mention of the Hera, an authentic sculptural work by Polykleitos, only adds to the confusion. The dates of the individual epigrams in the *APl* that do not also appear in the *AP*, including all of Bk. 16, are contested; in all likelihood they are Byzantine. Problems aside, however, its similarities with Euripides' description are too striking to dismiss out of hand:

> This is the Polyxena of Polycleitus, and no other hand touched this divine picture. It is a twin sister of his Hera. See how, her robe being torn, she covers her nakedness with her modest hand. The unhappy maiden is supplicating for her life, and in her eyes lies all of the Trojan war.[48]

Polygnotus' name is very likely to be associated with the painting of Polyxena that Pausanias, in a passage quoted above (1. 22. 6), saw in the picture gallery of the Propylaea of the Athenian acropolis. This could be the painting seen, or read about, by the epigrammist. There, we are told, Polyxena is "about to be sacrificed ((μέλλουσά ἐστι σφάζεσθαι Πολυξένη)) near the grave of Achilles." Unfortunately Pausanias does not describe the picture any further. However, his observation that it depicted the *prelude* to the sacrifice rather than the act itself is telling. The painting could very well have featured an erotically charged ritual by which Polyxena consents to her own sacrifice, which Euripides chose to dramatize. Since Polygnotus was a master in the representation of *êthos* (see further below), it makes sense that he would choose to depict a moment when Polyxena's emotions were on full display, that is, *before* the sacrifice. Moreover, when he notices a braided young Polyxena among the

---

[47] Sevinç, "A New Sarcophagus of Polyxena," with reconstruction drawing, fig. 9.

[48] Trans. W.R. Paton, *The Greek Anthology*, 5 (1918; repr. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1979).

Trojan women in Polygnotus' "Ilioupersis" at Delphi, Pausanias (10. 25. 10) adds in passing: "Poets sing of her death at the tomb of Achilles, and both at Athens and at Pergamus on the Caïcus I have seen the sufferings (τὰ παθήματα) of Polyxena depicted in paintings." If Pausanias has Euripides in mind as one of the poets, then his juxtaposition of poetry and painting, rather than sculpture, could have been deliberate. Perhaps both painter and poet were known to be in the habit of featuring a brave, beautiful, semi-nude Trojan girl confronting her Greek slaughterers with a nobility that is missing among the men involved in one of the two most cowardly acts—the bookends, in fact—of the Trojan debacle, the other being the sacrifice of Iphigenia.

Another possible allusion to an existing painting, likewise involving female sacrifice, is found in Euripides' posthumous *Iphigenia at Aulis*. At *IA* 1550 a messenger reports of Agamemnon's veiling his face with his peplos (ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς) in sorrow and in shame as his brave young daughter, Iphigenia, approaches, willingly anticipating the impending sacrifice. This touching detail does not occur in Aeschylus' version of the sacrifice of Iphigenia (*Ag.* 228–247). An explanation may lie in a famous painting depicting the sacrifice of Iphigenia by Timanthes, a late-fifth, early-fourth century contemporary of Parrhasios and Zeuxis, that would have been too late for Aeschylus to have known, but, to judge from its subsequent fame, an artistic sensation at the time of *IA*'s writing, garnering favorable praise by viewers and critics of the day. In it, we are told (Pliny 35. 73; Quint., *Inst.* 2. 13. 13, et al.[49]), the painter had effectively depicted Menelaus and other prominent Greeks who were present and emotionally affected by the proceedings. However, having exhausted his painterly repertory of expressions and furthermore defeated by the profundity of Agamemnon's unparalleled grief, he made the artistic decision to veil ("velavit," in both of the above sources) the father's face, leaving viewers to deduce in their imaginations the proper configuration of features that would fairly represent the father's frame of mind. A reflection of Timanthes' composition may be seen in a Roman wall painting from the House of the Tragic Poet at Pompeii, now housed in Naples, which shows Agamemnon conspicuously veiling his face with his peplos.[50] Miller, who also observes similarities between the *IA* passage

[49] Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 156–157; we are not told the painting's location; Timanthes was said to be from the island of Kythnos. Pliny 35. 72, on a painting competition between Timanthes and Parrhasios, helps with the floruit.

[50] Ling, *Roman Painting*, fig. 139.

and Timanthes' painting, rejects the notion that it could have served as Euripides' source of inspiration, on the basis of chronology.[51] While I hesitate to push my argument on its behalf further, the coincidence of such striking imagery is simply too powerful too overlook.[52]

Paintings as Instructors

Whether Euripides intended for his audience to think of a specific painting at the mention of ἀγάλματος κάλλιστα at *Hec.* 560–561 and ὀμμάτων πέπλον προθείς at *IA* 1550 cannot be known for sure. (Sculpture of course is also a possibility in the former instance.) I have argued in each case that he did intend, and even counted on, precisely that outcome, even if I have not been able to demonstrate definitively the work of art that he had in mind. However, further reinforcement for my conviction is to be found in the plays. The contents of paintings are regarded as instructive on several occasions in Euripides. While specific works are once again not named (and why should they be?), as a whole, these passages reveal once again that, for those cities especially rich in the visual arts, such as Athens and Delphi, their graphic offerings were well-noted and remembered by both residents and visitors alike. Of the visual arts paintings in particular offered themselves as a readily available and definitive source of information and as such are cited when a Euripidean character's expressed knowledge of a topic requires the stamp of credibility.

A fairly straightforward example is found at *Ph.* 129–130, when Antigone compares Hippomedon's face and stature with that of an earthborn giant that she has seen "in paintings" (ἐν γραφαῖσιν) of the Gigantomachy (more on this below). More interesting is an exchange between Ion and Creusa in *Ion*. Early in the play the temple boy's attention is drawn to a strange, unhappy woman whose demeanor and physical appearance he suspects stem from a noble background. His suspicions are correct; during the course of an extended stichomythia in which each anticipates the other's response, Creusa recounts for Ion the highlights of the history of her royal Athenian pedigree. Ion is familiar with much of the tale, although in questioning the validity of some of the details, he

[51] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 644–646.

[52] So affective was Pliny's description of this lost painting for post-antique audiences, it may well be the inspiration for every subsequent depiction of a veiled, faceless, sorrowing figure in Christian art; however, that is an argument for another occasion.

displays the habit of skepticism that will manifest itself throughout the play. His main source of information appears to be visual representations that he has seen, we must assume, at Delphi, of the various and already canonical incidents that comprise the mythology of the autochthonic origins of the Athenian race. Upon Creusa's mention of Athena handing over the newly earth-born Erichthonios to the daughters of Cecrops for safekeeping, Ion responds: δίδωσι δ', ὥσπερ ἐν γραφῇ νομίζεται ("And she gave him, just as is customary in painting," *Ion* 271). Creusa finishes his sentence for him—the two are so in sync in their introduction scene that they anticipate each other's thoughts—but Ion is immediately ready with knowledge about the next part of the story. Only this time he identifies a different source for his knowledge: This is something he has heard rather than something he knows from paintings: ἤκουσα λῦσαι παρθένους τεῦχος θεᾶς ("I heard that the girls freed him from the goddess' container," *Ion* 273). Clearly Ion is in possession of a great deal information about Erechtheid protohistory, some stories by hearsay and others because he has had ample opportunity to study pictures.[53]

Ion's mentioning painting as a source for his knowledge about history is entirely in keeping with the mood of this play, which is full of references to the visual arts, to which we will devote the next chapter. The entering chorus has already sung an admiring ekphrasis on the works of sculptural art decorating the temple of Apollo. And before the play is over there will be another, equally lavish ekphrasis on the tapestries of the ceremonial tent that Ion erects at the site. These multiple references to visual works of art in one play are not fortuitous, nor should they be thought of as functioning irrespective of one another as colorful tropes, but rather as staggered increments of an ongoing, meta-visual reflection on the themes of the play, as has been noted. Zeitlin comments on the significance of Ion's remark at v. 271: "The source [*sic*] of Ion's knowledge are both word and image. But note the psychological astuteness of the single detail ascribed to visual memory. It occurs at the moment when a child, another child, changed hands and was given to others to keep but not to look upon, the very scene that throughout the play haunts Ion's imagination about his own origins." Zeitlin continues, drawing a connection between *Ion* 271 and the ekphrasis on the tent: "A spectator captivated by the emotive fascination of pictures with which he can psychologically identify, Ion constructs a gorgeous spectacle for others

---

[53] As Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 189, observes, examples of representations of this scene may be found in *LIMC* 1, pt. 2, s. v. Aglauros, Herse, Pandrosos, pls. 6–8, 15–19.

to see (θαῦμα), assembling a composite edifice out of a vast storehouse of assorted images, accumulated over time and fittingly pieced together to form a complex, enigmatic, but fluent whole."[54]

The panhellenic sanctuary of Delphi was by the fifth century BC a thesaurus of imagery related to the official histories, ancient and contemporary, of the Greek cities, a veritable "bible of the poor" where numerous myths could be read in paintings, sculptures, tapestries, and the minor arts in the iconic version that the dedicating city had determined was proper for both Greek and foreign visitors to be exposed to. Delphi was, in short, a microcosm of tendentious information—also known as propaganda—presented in visual format. It is not surprising that Ion is well-informed about Athenian protohistory and that one of the sources for his knowledge has been the consumption of works of art dedicated in the sanctuary. Among commentators Owen has attempted to identify specific fifth-century works which Ion might have had in mind from among the many depictions of these scenes, not necessarily associated with Delphi, and mostly in the medium of vase painting, which would equally well be designated as ἐν γραφῇ as free painting, but is far less likely to be the intended referent.[55] From the other side archaeologists have been equally diligent in seizing on this passage as corroborative testimony for the popularity of the myth in art. Morris, citing examples, observes that the birth of Erichthonios was "a frequent theme on early classical vases" and deduces from *Ion* 271 that it was also "perhaps the subject of larger paintings."[56] Shapiro points to the prevalence of the theme in Euripides' own day: "In the final decade of the [fifth] century, the motif of the Kekropidai witnessing the birth of Erichthonios was handled by both painters and sculptors in a variety of ways. Indeed, so popular must the theme have been in the visual arts that even Euripides acknowledges it [in *Ion* 271]."[57] For the present purposes we need only note that depictions of these myths were readily available for Euripides to see, and that Ion's reference to what is "customary in painting" demonstrates that depicted versions of these stories were as authoritative a source as verbal versions, especially so in the unique case of Delphi.

---

54 Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye," p. 155.
55 Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 92.
56 Morris, *Daidalos*, p. 328, with n. 46.
57 H.A. Shapiro, "The Cult of Heroines: Kekrops' Daughters," in *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece*, ed. Ellen E. Reeder (Baltimore, MD, and Princeton, 1995), pp. 39–48 (46).

Painting is again cited, along with hearsay, as a canon of authenticity, this time on a more mundane subject, in *Trojan Women*. Hecuba is bemoaning her impending sea voyage to Greece. She observes that although she has never been "inside the hull of a ship," meaning of course, on board a seagoing vessel,[58] she is nonetheless knowledgeable about a ship's appearance from "having seen [it] in painting and hearing" about it (γραφῇ δ' ἰδοῦσα καὶ κλύουσ' ἐπίσταμαι, *Tr.* 687). Paley, deducing from this line that "Sea-pieces must therefore have been painted at the time of Euripides," cites a passage from Herodotus (4. 88) describing a painting of the "bridge of boats" across the Hellespont that Darius had constructed during his march to Greece that was commissioned and dedicated in the temple of Hera by Mandrocles the Samian, the bridge's architect; the artist is not named.[59] Herodotus must have seen this painting himself during his visit to the Heraion (3. 60); Strabo (14. 1. 14) confirms that the temple was an art gallery.[60] Hecuba's remark also suggests, not incidentally, that it was not uncommon for women to frequent places where paintings were displayed,[61] and that much technical knowledge could be gained by looking at works of art, which contradicts somewhat the argument made by Socrates against Ion in Plato's *Ion* that knowledge of one of the mimetic arts does not necessarily give one expertise in the *technê* being imitated.[62] More significantly, we have already discussed what Barlow calls Hecuba's "preoccupation with ships" in this play and how great is her fear of them, citing the frequency of nautical metaphors and references which culminate, finally, in the fateful words of the chorus which close the play: "Woe to the wretched city! Nevertheless get yourselves to the ships of the Achaians."[63] Adding to her anxiety is Helen's impending presence aboard Menelaus' ship at *Tr.* 1050. In short empirical knowledge

[58] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 195, notes: "The periphrasis [for ship] ναός … σκάφος occurs frequently in Eur."

[59] Paley^2 1, p. 515, ad v. 681; cf. Parmentier in Léon Parmentier and Henri Grégoire, *Euripide*, 4 (Paris, 1925), p. 56, n. 2: "Peut-être y a-t-il ici une allusion à quelque tableau de tempête d'un peintre contemporain." Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 649, also deduces that "a painting, probably well known to the audience, of a storm at sea" is the likely referent.

[60] W.W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 1 (Oxford, 1912), pp. 30 and 334. Strabo 14. 1. 14: … καὶ τὸ Ἡραῖον, ἀρχαῖον ἱερὸν καὶ νεὼς μέγας, ὃς νῦν πινακοθήκη ἐστί.

[61] Cf. Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 277, who considers *Tr.* 687 "ein bemerkenswertes Zeugnis" about the lives of women in Classical Athens.

[62] Pl. *Ion* 537a–542b; the argument is developed in *R.* 10.

[63] Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 193; *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 117–119.

of the decks of ships is not something Hecuba hopes to add to her life's experiences at this time; she does not want to verify what she believes to be true from pictures and stories.[64] As a woman, and a queen, until now having been spared this man's and slave's eye view of the world, being on a ship can only mean one thing to Hecuba, exile and humiliating servitude to a foreign master. No, she would be content to preserve her precious second-hand knowledge of nautical matters gained through the pleasurable activities of viewed pictures and heard tales.

Virtually the same phraseology is used at *Hipp*. 1004–1005 where Hippolytus pleads to his father his innocence of having slept with his stepmother by claiming that he is still a virgin, knowing nothing about the sex act except what he has heard in conversation and has seen in pictures (οὐκ οἶδα πρᾶξιν τήνδε πλὴν λόγῳ κλύων / γραφῇ τε λεύσσων). We should think both of portrayals of the activities of the gods in monumental and vase painting as well as of more properly pornographic genre imagery, well-documented on vases but possibly also found in free painting in certain locales, as they were in Rome. Presumably the pictures have made more of an impression on him than the conversations because Hippolytus goes on to specify that (of course!) he has not even liked what he has *seen* (σκοπεῖν, v. 1005), attesting to the superiority of the visual over the verbal from a didactic point of view, at least on this particular subject. For Hippolytus the repertory of reputable sources of knowledge about sexual matters is now complete; written works (γραφάς ... τῶν παλαιτέρων, v. 451) had been cited earlier as voices of authority for the loves of Zeus.[65] Thus no one can say that he does not know of which he speaks, since he has consulted poems, his peers, and works of art to learn about sex. However, above all, graphic visual portrayals of lovers

[64] Cf. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 187 (ad *Ph*. 128–129): "References in tragedy to something seen only in art may imply the speaker's lack of first-hand experience or the monstrosity or foreignness of the thing referred to."

[65] Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 242, is wise to resist the temptation "with many editors" (e.g., Paley^2 1, p. 194) to take γραφάς as "paintings." He cites τῶν παλαιτέρων, asking "what *old* paintings would there be in a private household of Eur.'s day?" and, further, "why should one know one's legends from *old* paintings rather than new?". Barrett deduces that "τῶν παλαιτέρων is appropriate only to poets, not to painters." αὐτοί τ' εἰσὶν ἐν μούσαις ἀεί renders this interpretation unequivocal. On behalf of paintings, see Easterling, "Anachronism in Greek Tragedy," p. 6, n. 26. For books as sources of knowledge, cf. E. *Alc*. 966–967, *IA* 798–800, fr. 369. 6–7 (*Erec*.), and the discussion of Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 185. For art works as a source of information, in addition to the Euripidean examples, cf. A. *Supp*. 282–286, *Eum*. 49–52.

have made clear to Hippolytus that sexual intercourse holds no appeal for him, a disastrous resistance to nature that sets in motion the tragic sequence of events.

Painting is cited as an authority not only for subject matter, as in the passages just reviewed, but also for a certain keenness or clarity of vision that it puts on display. To judge from additional evidence in the plays, Euripides realizes that the painter's relationship with perceptible reality is altogether different from the sculptor's, not to mention from the ordinary person's. A prerequisite for being a successful representational painter is an ability to surmise how optical truth might be altered and adjusted most effectively for the purposes of re-presentation on the two-dimensional surface. Observation is merely the prelude to a complex series of decisions that a painter must make. The laborious process of re-presentation that constitutes the painter's *apatê* requires expertise of the mind and the eye from start to finish, with the end result being the most efficient and convincing—and most disconcerting—mimetic image that the individual artist is capable of producing.

One of the best known and most discussed of Euripidean images inspired by the visual arts offers a rare glimpse into this process. At *Hec.* 807–808 Hecuba invites Agamemnon to observe in all its completeness the ravages of her agony by stepping back from her person in order to gain the perspective of distance. The simile that she chooses to define the quality of the activity she requests is striking: ... ὡς γραφεύς τ' ἀποσταθεὶς / ἰδοῦ με κἀνάθρησον οἷ' ἔχω κακά ("... and after stepping away like a painter, look at me and gaze earnestly at what sort of misfortunes I possess").[66] Recent interpretations of the scene include Charles E. Mercier's, who sees Hecuba's supplication as a performance and thereby an exploitation of another kind of *technê*: "Hekabe demands that Agamemnon appreciate her performance, bidding him look upon her and the action she maintains as one painter appreciating the work of another."[67] Following Zeitlin, Steiner suggests that, in "casting Agamemnon in the role of artist," Hecuba casts *herself* in the role of painted figure

---

[66] The heart of the simile, γραφεύς, was obelized by Gilbert Murray, *Euripidis Fabulae*, 1 (Oxford, 1913), without being followed. As Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 155, n. 28 observes: "... there seems no warrant for this. γραφεύς makes perfectly good sense as a unique and precise simile." Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, p. 171, compares *Hipp.* 1078–1079.

[67] Charles E. Mercier, "Hekabe's Extended Supplication (*Hec.* 752–888)," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993), pp. 149–160 (159).

or a model for such and thereby an object of the painter's careful scrutiny. In imposing on Agamemnon the abilities of a "skilled spectator," that is, one who is versed in the tricks of the painter's trade, Hecuba invites a "more acute awareness of her sufferings," in hopes of gaining a more sympathetic response.[68] As insightful as they are, these interpretations, along with Mossman's, "she compares herself to a portrait of unhappiness,"[69] overlook the main point of Hecuba's appeal: that only by moving away from her will Agamemnon be able to comprehend the full impact of her suffering. Barlow, on the other hand, is on the right track: "Hecuba wants the full extent of her grief to be realized. This can only be done by a contemplation of it in its full perspective. The simile describes the process as comparable to the way a painter gets the full measure and perspective of his work by standing back from the canvas and looking at it objectively."[70]

Justina Gregory, while she ignores the most critical aspect of the simile, its subject, nonetheless offers incisive analysis: "The attitude least conducive to pity and most likely to encourage anger is to dwell closely on the situation at hand, concentrating on it so closely that the vision becomes distorted." Gregory proceeds to make an analogy with Cleon's exhortation to the Athenian assembly during the debate about the proper punishment for the Mytileneans, who have revolted against Athens, as reported by Thucydides (3. 40. 7). Cleon, observes Gregory, urges the Athenians "not to yield to pity for the rebels, but rather to fuel their rage by 'getting as close as possible to the state of mind of being injured' [ἐγγύτατα τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ πάσχειν]."[71] The susceptibility of Athenians to the suffering of others (at least when it bears upon themselves in some way) is made clear by their response to Phrynichus' tragedy on the fall of Miletus, which set the audience to such uncontrollable weeping with the result that the author was fined and future performances of his drama were banned (Hdt. 6. 21). In Cleon's view renewed acquaintance with the evidence of their own past suffering would allow the Athenians to find the reasons they need to decide on a current course of appropriate punishment. Thus, Hecuba requests the opposite, the distanced perspective that

[68] Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye," p. 142; Steiner, *Images in Mind*, pp. 51–52, with further discussion of the ramifications of Hecuba's objectification of herself.

[69] Mossman, *Wild Justice*, p. 111.

[70] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 155–156, n. 28.

[71] Gregory, *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*, pp. 103–104.

lends itself to pity rather than the close-in view that encourages a level of empathy that leads to introspection and, ultimately, to an unsympathetic, self-serving response.

But what makes Euripides' image much more dramatic than Thucydides' is the focus on viewing, which catapults us instantly into the domain of painting; hence, the simile. Hecuba's appeal is couched in terms of the painter who has constantly to stand back from his work in order to apprehend whether or not his illusion is working. Normally, one would associate increased clarity of perception with closer proximity. The irony of stepping back, as opposed to stepping forward, in order to see more clearly may in fact be comprehensible only in the context of the actions of the painter. Modern parallels are easy to find; the phenomenon described by Hecuba will be familiar to anyone who has ever painted or watched someone else paint.[72] Full clarity for a painter is only possible when he/she takes into account all prospective views of his/her work. The painter's eye view is not necessarily the natural one, particularly if the individual is near-sighted. An illusion or intended effect that appears to be working from a vantage point roughly equal to the length of one's nose may appear wrong from any distance, that is, the work can seem distorted or untruthful to the representational painter, or ineffective or unintentionally discordant to the abstract painter. Forms, shapes, colors, and lines, the ingredients of painting, ancient or modern, are exposed for what they are; color mixtures or juxtapositions are seen to work or not work, perspective lines either convey a sense of distance properly or are exposed as pointless, compositional arrangements are revealed as pleasing or jarring. In a metaphorical sense the perspective of distance—as of the "perspective" of time—is thought to have an ordering effect that is impossible to attain if one does not bother to seek out a second opinion, so to speak, by changing one's vantage point, by viewing events through another lens. In short close-up views can be deceptive; the long view has not become proverbial for objectivity without reason.

---

[72] An art critic who has observed the contemporary New York painter, Marjorie Welish, in her studio has written of Welish's working habits: "She has worn out the crepe soles of her shoes stepping up to and back from canvases as she paints" (Naomi Spector, in an essay which accompanied an exhibition of Welish's Paintings at the Ben Shahn Galleries, Wayne, New Jersey, 1997), a remark that is as perfectly comprehensible in the face of one of Welish's precise geometric abstract canvases which are vaguely reminiscent of Mondrian as of a realistic still life by Willem Kalf. See also the interesting observations of John Hyman, *The Objective Eye. Color, Form, and Reality in the Theory of Art* (Chicago and London, 2006), p. 145, with quotations from Diderot, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Proust concerning this phenomenon among the painters of their respective times.

A gnomic statement made at *Ion* 585–586 may also be related to this particular habit of the painter, although the art of painting itself is not actually mentioned.[73] After a long exchange in which Ion questions the validity of the declaration of paternity with which he has just been confronted, and is at last convinced that Xuthus is his father, the boy is compelled to remark: οὐ ταὐτὸν εἶδος φαίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων / πρόσωθεν ὄντων ἐγγύθεν θ᾽ ὁρωμένων (literally, "Not the same form appears of things being far away and things seen close up," or, more loosely, "Things far away take on a different appearance when seen from close up").[74] Unlike Hecuba's request, which view is preferred is left unclear, but the explicitness of that simile suggests that the sentiment is comparable. True, as much could be said of the real world as of the represented world, and I will not go so far as to claim that Euripides has only the represented world in mind. Yet it is not inconceivable that the problems posed by mimetic representation in the visual arts while it was still in the formative stages of its development in Classical Greece helped to galvanize those inclined to contemplation to reconsider how individuals see the real world and on whose terms.[75] Art and perception have always been intertwined in the western world, primarily because of the Greeks. Aesthetics, as the study of theories of art and beauty has been called since the eighteenth-century, incorporates in its name (αἰσθάνομαι, "perceive") the very essence of the mimetic nature of the arts, which depends upon perception. Ion's remark therefore takes on added depth if one thinks in terms of the difficulties that mimesis poses for the painter who seeks to represent the visible world accurately and convincingly, the diverse, often ingenious resolutions to which invite us all to take stock of how we perceive the real world.

---

[73] Cf. Paley² 2, pp. 48–49, with insightful commentary on the immediate ramifications of Ion's statement.

[74] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 226, compares *Rh.* 482, "for the phrasing"; there the sense is something like: "'Do not be looking at things far ahead and neglect the things close up" (μή νυν τὰ πόρσω τἀγγύθεν μεθεὶς σκόπει). Pausanias' (1. 21. 3) description of the image of Niobe on Mt. Sipylus is worth recalling: "When you are near it is a beetling crag, with not the slightest resemblance to a woman, mourning or otherwise; but if you go further away you will think you see a woman in tears with head bowed down," (trans. Jones, *Pausanius*, 1).

[75] Stephen Halliwell, "Plato and Painting," in *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*, eds. N. Keith Rutter and Brian A. Sparkes (Edinburgh, 2000), pp. 99–116 (110, n. 30), observes that Plato's comments on distance viewing may be connected to the development of *skiagraphia* in painting; cf., e.g., *Sph.* 234b, *Tht.* 208e, *Prm.* 165c, and *R.* 523b, where it is explicitly mentioned. Paley² 2, p. 49, with a reminder that the general sentiment of *Ion* 585–586 is "a favourite metaphor of Plato's," adds further comparanda, *Tht.* 165d, *Prt.* 356c, *R.* 602c.

It may be significant that, in Ion's phrasing, the things at a distance simply "are" (ὄντων), while the things close up are "being seen" (or "seeming") (ὁρωμένων), as if the close-up view is, once again, the potentially deceptive one. We are clearly in the realm of the paradox of reality versus appearances beloved by Euripides,[76] a paradox with special resonance in the visual arts. As it happens the language used in the *Ion* passage echoes the language of an antithesis that is on more than one occasion encountered in ancient thought, an idea that enjoyed currency during Euripides' lifetime and well into the fourth century. Perhaps the most familiar statement of this antithesis concerns not painters but sculptors. This is a claim attributed to Lysippos of Sikyon, the most esteemed of fourth-century masters, by Pliny (34. 65), and concerns unspecified "older" sculptors depicting "men as they were" (quales essent) whereas, he, himself, depicts "men as they appeared to be" (quales viderentur esse). There has been much speculation about what is meant by the comparison, which we need not enter into here. A few general observations only are required to make the point. The "older" sculptor that Lysippos likely has in mind is his fifth-century predecessor, Polykleitos of Argos, the inventor of a canon of proportions and the creator of a work and a treatise both known as the "Canon," and a qualitative improvement between the generations they represent seems to be implied. If fourth-century sculpture is both different and better than fifth-century sculpture, how so?

I suggest that it has to do with formal and conceptual problems addressed by the two sculptors in very different ways. Both being different and being better have something to do with being more optically realistic in style. Of two distinct approaches to mimetic realism in sculpture, that which is measurably demonstrable (the works of Polykleitos) as opposed to that which is optically authentic or effective (the works of Lysippos), the latter was evidently preferred in Lysippos' day.[77] What we are talking about is, in essence, the difference between the conceptual (representing what is known) and the perceptual (representing what is seen) approach to representation, and once again, it is the latter that is regarded as more mimetically correct in a work of art, if Pliny's statement is accurate for Lysippos' time period. But to what extent is visible

---

[76] Mark Griffith, *The Authenticity of "Prometheus Bound"* (Cambridge, Eng., 1977), p. 219, noting "the remarkable occurrences of λόγῳ / ἔργῳ" at A. *Pr.* 336, 1080 (λόγῳ/ μύθῳ), observes that this common formulation for the contrast between appearance and reality appears for the first time, in its conventional dative form, at *Alc.* 339.

[77] This would have its direct equivalent in Plato's "eikastic" and "phantastic" modes of mimesis (*Soph.* 235d–237a), on which see Halliwell, "Plato and Painting," pp. 127–128.

reality reality at all? In answering this question we must consider what role artifice plays in fooling, and pleasing, the eye. In order to achieve his goal of optical authenticity or effectiveness, Lysippos resorted to a high level of artifice. He developed a new canon of proportions for the sole purpose of achieving an optical illusion, whereas Polykleitos' canon had been intended to achieve perfect form.[78] While the works of both Polykleitos and Lysippos are to be admired as art, Lysippos' can be said to be the more artificial of the two styles. I say artificial because of the latter sculptor's predisposition to visual and aesthetic effect over measurable accuracy (if I am interpreting Pliny correctly), and his willingness to compromise reality for the sake of artfulness, in other words, to sacrifice nature for art, resulting in the supreme paradox of realism at the expense of reality. And yet the means or measures by which the artifice was achieved would be invisible except to the enlightened few, composed mainly of fellow artisans, who knew where to look for it; everyone else would simply appreciate the "truth" that the distanced view offered to the eye. In other words, in a work of art, the illusion is everything; how it works, however, is a matter of concern only to its creator and his peers.

It is tempting to see a corollary between the work of Lysippos and the ideas expressed in both Euripidean passages under consideration: Lysippos' works might not stand the test of close observation, since actual measurements might prove a limb to be too long or a head too small, whereas Polykleitos' "Canon" could and apparently did stand up to close scrutiny, as evidenced by the repeated examination by other sculptors to which it was apparently subjected in antiquity (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 5. 12. 21; Cicero, *Brutus* 296). But of course we cannot apply this particular analogy directly to Euripides, since Lysippos lived and worked in the fourth century. Yet its possible ramifications in fourth-century sculpture are nonetheless worth considering because Pliny's statement is, as it seems, merely an adaptation of a popular formula which had, in fact, been applied to Euripides, himself, suggesting that the idea at its

[78] The bibliography is enormous; more recent work includes Adolf H. Borbein, "Polykleitos," and Charles M. Edwards, "Lysippos," in *Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture*, eds. Olga Palagia and J.J. Pollitt (Yale Classical Studies) 30 (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), pp. 66–90 and 130–153; J.J. Pollitt, "The *Canon* of Polykleitos and Other Canons," in *Polykleitos, The Doryphoros, and Tradition*, ed. Warren G. Moon (Madison, WI, 1995), pp. 19–24. The major sources for Polykleitos and Lysippos are conveniently assembled in Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 75–79 and 98–104. David Summers, *Michelangelo and the Language of Art* (Princeton, 1981), p. 398, discusses the Pliny passage and its context in the Renaissance.

heart was current in the fifth century, as well. This is Sophocles' purported declaration, quoted by Aristotle, that he (Sophocles) depicted men as they ought to be while Euripides depicted men as they are (οἷον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἵους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἰσίν, *Po.* 1460b33–34). While a moral or ethical dimension may be inferred from this version of the antithesis, it is clear from the verb ποιεῖν that we are still in the realm of art, of truth (= realism) versus a form of idealization (= optical fidelity),[79] with the latter apparently to be preferred; Sophocles, after all, defeated Euripides repeatedly during the years in which they competed. Nor is Euripides likely to have been flattered by the remark, since "men as they ought to be" (= "men as they appear to be," in Pliny), while they do not profit by close scrutiny, are seen to be truer in the long view, which is the one that counts.

This antithesis is essentially about optical refinements in the mimetic arts, both literal (art and architecture) or figurative (drama), which were greatly admired in the second half of the fifth century, the heyday of sophism where effectiveness of speech mattered more than strict fidelity to truth. The broad application of the concept may be seen in one of Plato's many critiques of it, *Sophist* 236a–b, on the artist who adjusts the proportions of a colossus to suit the viewer's vantage point, thereby sacrificing "truth" for "beauty," while the discussion that follows explicitly addresses the issue of reality versus appearances, of the art of making a true likeness (εἰκών) of something and the art of making a semblance (φάντασμα). Architecture, too, falls victim to the same kind of subterfuge. While only one architect's treatise has survived from antiquity, and that from first-century BC. Rome, we may assume that optical refinements were central to the era of Iktinos and Kallikrates, whose Parthenon has been demonstrated to exhibit them to a greater degree than any other Classical building.[80] In his book on the Ionic order, for instance, Vitruvius (3. 5. 9) explains why the proportions of the architrave must be adjusted in accordance with the columns' height, in order to compensate for the difficulty that the eye encounters "cutting through" (persecat) the "thickness of the air" (aeris crebritatem) at greater heights, another occasion for measurable reality ("men as they are") being properly sacrificed to beauty ("men as they ought to be," "men as they appear to be"), with the long view in mind. These ideas had a long shelf

[79] S.H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (New York, 1951), p. 101, curiously, but evidently of the same mind, translates "drew."

[80] Robertson, *Handbook*, pp. 115–118.

life; Horace (*Ars Poetica* 361–362) brings up the issue of close versus distant viewing of a painting or a poem in the process of making the "ut pictura poesis" analogy, but avoids the judgmental tone of the earlier examples (cf. Lucian *Pr. Im.* 12). In the intellectual discourse surrounding issues of perception, disciplinary boundaries between art, literature, and philosophy evaporated; this is just the sort of subject matter that might have been entertained in the context of a symposium, and Euripides' language suggests that he might have held his own in any such debates.

Before leaving the passages from *Hecuba* and *Ion* we might consider the possible relevance of an important technical innovation in monumental painting that very likely occurred during Euripides' lifetime. This is the invention of the technique known as σκιαγραφία, commonly translated "shadow painting," which is generally credited to Apollodorus, an Athenian painter of the last quarter of the fifth century BC, one of the more famous of the generation after Polygnotus.[81] Because many of the ancient testimonia that address the nature of this innovation are concentrated among the philosophers, especially Plato, and their contexts have allowed for differing interpretations, the sources have tended to obscure rather than resolve the question of what exactly *skiagraphia* is in craftsmen's terms, giving rise to a lively and ongoing scholarly debate.[82] This much is clear from the sources: The term encompasses one or more newly invented devices which were thought to mark an advance in the illusionistic representation of a three-dimensional object on a two-dimensional surface. Whether one subscribes to the majority view that the term refers to the technique that we now call shading or *chiaroscuro*, or whether one follows the more radical interpretation of Keuls, who has argued that the technique is akin to some sort of color-modeling,[83] and as such, would anticipate Cézanne, the cluster of issues which the discovery and use of *skiagraphia* generated are again centered on the potential for deception in viewing, which is the target of the Euripidean passages. The simplest and least problematic translation of the term would seem to be "modeling," if modeling be defined as using two-dimensional means to suggest a third dimension. Whether this is done with line, where it is called foreshortening; with modulations of intensity within a single color, which is called shading; by exploiting the natural recessive or progressive tenden-

[81] For the ancient sources for Apollodorus, see Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 147–148; for discussion of his floruit, see Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, p. 411.

[82] The sources are assembled by Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 247–254, with commentary.

[83] Keuls, *Painter and Poet*, pp. 107–144.

cies of certain colors, that is, some form of color-modeling; or through a combination of any or all of these devices, the result is the same: the illusion of a third dimension. The shading technique is the one most likely to have been invented by Apollodorus; however, this is not the occasion to argue the point in full.[84]

Striving for the most successful illusion, individual painters likely would specialize in one or another of these techniques, just as in later times Michelangelo would be associated with an expertise in linear foreshortening that remains unsurpassed, whereas artists such as Leonardo and Rembrandt would be equally admired for a more painterly *chiaroscuro*. Each of these painters attained virtually palpable levels of three-dimensionality in their work, but by entirely different means. We should imagine much the same with the pioneer illusionists of ancient times. Regardless how it was achieved, the artificial third-dimension that is the sole province of painting, as opposed to sculpture, was anathema for various categories of ancient truth-seekers. It is easy to understand why. When viewed from a proper distance, these images work. When viewed up close, they are seen for what they are, tricks of the trade. E.H. Gombrich has called these intentional deceptions the "sacrifices of illusionism."[85] To understand how the ancients came to distrust the new technique, once again we may compare modern examples of both the painterly and linear styles which would be the equivalents, in terms of ancient *skiagraphia*, of shading or foreshortening, respectively. The work by Chardin or Monet (painterly shaders, both) that makes perfect sense from a distance but which, when viewed close-up, dissolves into an abstract chaos of seemingly random paint strokes, illustrates the reservations of both Hecuba and Ion about the close-in vantage point, as would the Michelangelo or the David (both linear artists), whose forms when viewed up-close would resume the meaningless, and frequently absurd shapes required to produce them. For when viewed up close a form is restored to a shape, with an outline which had successfully implied the third-dimension when viewed from a distance no longer performing its

---

[84] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 251; cf. Bruno, *Form and Color*, p. 37, who attributes a more radical form of *chiaroscuro* to his successor, Zeuxis.

[85] E.H. Gombrich, *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (Bollington Series) 25. 5 (Princeton, 1972), p. 139, with fig. 99, illustrates his point with a drawing of a seagull with one wing rendered correctly in perspective and one foot "missing," concessions that would be sensible to those who are accustomed to the conventions of western art, but whose distortions disturbed the Australian aborigines to whom the drawing was shown.

intended function. The illusory volumetric form is reduced at close-hand to an incomprehensible scribble, having nothing to do with nature, and even less to do with reality. In each case it is the close-up view that breaks down, that reveals the artist's working method, but obscures the illusion, itself, which is the entire objective of the painted surface. On the other hand an equally convincing argument could be made that the close-up view of a painting would be the truer one, that is, the image would be seen for what it really is, an irrational assemblage of shapes, lines, and colors. But this is an argument Plato might have made; Euripides seems to have preferred the point of view argued here. Either way, interpreted against the backdrop of contemporary monumental painting, Hecuba's exhortation to her captor to "stand back" and Ion's wise-beyond-his-years remark assume a topical relevance.

Further Technical Developments

Imbedded in many of the passages considered in the previous section are profound ideas whose significance in ancient thought extends well beyond their deceptively humble artisinal roots to the borders of philosophical inquiry itself. We turn now to some other Euripidean images possibly inspired by monumental painting which, while not as far-reaching in their implications, are nonetheless diagnostic of the playwright's engagement with contemporary developments in the art form at all levels.

In an extended exchange in *Phoenician Women* (vv. 103–201) that takes place on the rooftop of the Theban palace, the Pedagogue points out to an inquisitive Antigone each of the seven captains of the advancing Argive army. Barlow, once again, has noticed the qualities that distinguish Euripides' handling of this scene from the earlier treatment of Aeschylus (*Th.* 375–676) as well as from the prototype, the *teichoskopia* of *Il.* 3.[86] Aeschylus' version, as Barlow describes it, is "full of pictorial detail which serves to illustrate the character and emotions of the leaders on the battlefield rather than the viewpoint of the narrator. Each pictorial motif is a symbol." In Euripides, on the other hand, "the heroes are important only insofar as they stand out visually as high points of relief in a much larger spectacle. Only what Antigone chooses to comment upon

[86] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 57–60, from which the following quotations are drawn.

is interesting." I further propose that the selective nature of Antigone's verbal re-presentation of the scene for an audience who cannot observe it for themselves is comparable to the selectivity demonstrated by a certain kind of painter who is faced with the task of portraying a sweeping, but detail-rich panorama. We should think not of a Uccello or a David (I have in mind such well-known paintings as Uccello's "Battle of San Romano" in the National Gallery, London, and David's "Coronation of Napoleon and Josephine" in the Louvre, where every detail is painstakingly reproduced), but rather of a Constable or a Renoir (e.g., Constable's "The Haywain" in the National Gallery, London; Renoir's "Au Moulin de la Gallette" in the Orsay Museum, Paris, where only impressions of significant aspects of the scene are rendered). Among the ancient practitioners, we should think of a Zeuxis rather than a Parrhasios.[87] This is painting that suggests rather than tells all, in short, exactly the kind of painting that was resolutely avant-garde in the late fifth and early fourth centuries, with the invention of *skiagraphia*.

Antigone, who controls the scene through her questions, lures the audience into envisioning an entire plain aglitter and in motion with flickering, star-like reflections as the sun fitfully alights upon and bounces back from the irregular, embossed surfaces of the warriors' armor.[88] Only after having surveyed the entire battlefield, "taking in one rapid glance the dazzling impression that the massed armaments make," in Barlow's words, does Antigone begin, with the aid of the Pedagogue, to distinguish individuals, and when she does, it is primarily through the specifics of their armor.[89] Like Ion, Hecuba, and Hippolotus, who cite painting as an authoritative source for useful information, Antigone sizes up the spectacle, according to Barlow, in "terms of reference known from art, the only experience she has had of battle. ... The whole scene is seen by Antigone in terms of relief by highlighting."[90] Barlow's use of the term "impression" will have special resonance with a modern audience, for Antigone's vision is very like that of the nineteenth-century Impressionist

[87] The two ancient painters' styles are compared by Bruno, *Form and Color*, pp. 31–44.

[88] Cf. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 57–58.

[89] Ibid, p. 58.

[90] Ibid; I part ways with Barlow, however, when she draws a comparison with the rare, three-dimensional rendering of the figure of the bronze-bodied giant Talos on the volute crater and namepiece of the Talos Painter (Ruvo, Jatta 1501; Boardman, *ARVC*, fig. 324). While this figure surely represents an attempt to imitate a modeling technique of contemporary monumental painting, it does not demonstrate the impressionistic painterly effects that I see in this passage.

painter who seeks not to replicate, illogically, every detail of a crowded tableau, but instead highlights the most distinctive, eye-catching features, leaving the rest to suggestive brush work, thereby opting for optical correctness rather than perfect verisimilitude. The suggestiveness that is the essence of *skiagraphia* would be the ancient equivalent.

Skiagraphia, as I proposed above, incorporated both purely graphic means of suggesting the third dimension and more properly painterly effects toward the same end. While there is an unmistakably painterly demeanor to Euripides' mode of articulating Antigone's rooftop survey, one particular image, I would argue, is better associated with a linear technique. Antigone strains to see her brother Polyneices in the distance, but is left with only a vague, impressionistic view of him which is, however, informative enough for her to recognize her brother in his distinctive corselet. At *Ph.* 161–162 she responds to the Pedagogue's question, ὁρᾷς, with: ὁρῶ δῆτ' οὐ σαφῶς, ὁρῶ δέ πως / μορφῆς τύπωμα στέρνα τ' ἐξεικασμένα, which, at its most straightforward, should surely mean: "I do not see him, exactly, but I can make out his body armor," if we presume a hendiadys, with τύπωμα and στέρνα constituting a reference to his armor, which is mentioned explicitly a few lines later (v. 168).[91] Still, the unusual phraseology has not escaped notice: τύπωμα ("moulded form, outline") occurs in literature only here and on one other occasion, Sophocles' *Electra* 54, where it is used of an "urn of molded metal,"[92] and this is the only occurrence of ἐξεικασμένα in Euripides.[93] In his comments on the passage, Mastronarde concludes that "the language emphasizes that there is something unreal, unoriginal, or unconcrete about what Ant. can experience of her brother."[94] Barlow adds that the use of the passive "implies an image as opposed to the real thing."[95] The presence of πως supports these interpretations. However, the fact that Euripides piles up in quick succession *three* terms with conceivable

[91] Cf. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 196 (followed by Kovacs, *Euripides*, 5, p. 229): "the moulded outline of his form and the semblance of his chest;" and Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 59: "the moulded shape of his form and the outline of his breastplate." I prefer to treat the image as a hendiadys, as reflected in my translation; cf. Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae*, p. 88.

[92] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 196, who suggests that it "was probably coined as a high-style variation on τύπος," itself a controversial term, usually translated as "impression" or its opposite, "relief," to be discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

[93] Mastronarde, Ibid, adding "twice Aesch., once Arist."

[94] Ibid.

[95] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 147, n. 75, citing Fraenkel's discussion of the use of the word at *Ag.* 1244.

artisanal application (μορφῆς, τύπωμα, and ἐξεικασμένα) to convey the image suggests that such interpretations are too reductive.

The combination of τύπωμα and μορφῆς, strongly suggestive of the solid basis and volumetric nature of *form*, implies a means of disclosing that is more properly sculptural than painterly, more concrete than shading or the impressionistic handling of an optically complex panoramic scene. In other words, we should look to *linear* rather than *painterly* methodologies for implying the third dimension which might yet fall within the purview of *skiagraphia*, to pursue our analogy with contemporary developments in monumental painting.[96] Although Parrhasios of Ephesos, who, as we have seen, was a younger contemporary of Euripides, is not directly linked with the practice, that he employed some variation of it may be inferred from what we know of his style. He was famous for the elegance and efficaciousness of his contour lines, of which Pliny (35. 67–68) has this to say:

> … it is acknowledged by artists that he was supreme in painting contour lines, which is the most subtle aspect of painting. For to paint corporeal forms and the mass of objects is no doubt a great achievement, but it is one in which many have achieved fame; but to make the contour lines of bodies and to include just the right amount when establishing the limits of a painted figure, is an artistic success rarely achieved. For the outline ought to round itself off and establish such limits that it suggests other things behind it and thus reveals even what it hides.[97]

What we learn from this passage is that the contour line, alone, may suggest the third dimension, if it is properly deployed.

The importance of outline to the history of art is reinforced by Pliny's famous anecdotal accounts of the origins of both the arts of painting and of modeling (πλαστική), which he associates in each case with the discovery of contour drawing. First, painting (35. 15):

> The origin of painting is obscure, and hardly falls within the scope of this work. The claim of the Egyptians to have discovered the art six thousand

---

[96] Noting that "the implication of μορφῆς τύπωμα is that the outline promises more than the eye can actually see," Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 59–60, with n. 75, also draws a connection with *skiagraphia*, but does not develop it: "Perhaps Euripides was thinking here of these new experiments with contour and outline. The somewhat laboured words suggest the attempt to express an unfamiliar concept"; cf. Paley[2] 3, p. 128: "I see the faint outline of his form, as in a picture."

[97] Trans. Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, p. 153, who collects the primary ancient sources for Parrhasios (pp. 153–156). Later painters also were skilled at the contour line: Pliny 35. 81–83 relates the tale of a contest of "tenuous lines" between Apelles and Protogenes.

> years before it reached Greece is obviously an idle boast, while among the Greeks some say that it was first discovered at Sikyon, others at Corinth. All, however, agree that painting began with the outlining of a man's shadow; this was the first stage, in the second a single colour was employed, and after the discovery of more elaborate methods this style, which is still in vogue, received the name of monochrome.[98]

On the origins of modeling, Pliny (35. 151) recounts the story of the Corinthian maid:

> Of painting I have said enough and more than enough, but it may be well to add some account of clay modelling. It was by the service of the selfsame earth that Boutades, a potter of Sikyon, discovered, with the help of his daughter, how to model portraits in clay. She was in love with a youth, and when he was leaving the country she traced the outline of the shadow which his face cast on the wall by lamplight. Her father filled in the outline with clay and made a model; this he dried and baked with the rest of his pottery, and we hear that it was preserved in the temple of the Nymphs, until Mummius overthrew Corinth.[99]

We have no way of knowing how old stories like these were by the time they reached Pliny. Quite possibly they reflect ideas that were current in Euripides' day, when painters were elevating the art of line to unprecedented levels of sophistication. The high status of outline persisted into the fourth century, to judge from Aristotle's parenthetical remark in *Poetics* (1450b) that an uncolored drawing gives greater pleasure than a painting.[100] Significantly, both of Pliny's accounts assume that the simple act of outlining a form was enough to suggest the next logical step in representation, the realization of the virtual third dimension. In both cases the mere tracings of outlines were the natural prelude to the artificial mechanics of effecting volume in a work of graphic art. It is as if the shape itself possessed an innate capacity to become form, and a little modeling (whether painted or plastic) would consummate the illusion.

With these ideas in mind we may return to *Ph.* 161–162. The suggestiveness, rather than conclusiveness, of an outline is brought out by the πως and the ἐξεικασμένα, perhaps better taken as middle than passive and having the sense "of its own accord, suggesting a semblance." (Note that there is no word for outline; it must be inferred.) Outline implies

[98] Trans. Jex-Blake/Sellers, p. 85.

[99] Tran. Jex-Blake/Sellers, p. 175.

[100] εἰ γάρ τις ἐναλείψειε τοῖς καλλίστοις φαρμάκοις χύδην, οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως εὐφράνειεν καὶ λευκογραφήσας εἰκόνα; a parallel is being drawn between the relative importance of characters (= the painting) and plot (= the drawing).

shape (2-D); shape moves to form (3-D) with the addition of τύπωμα, and μορφῆς is finally the word that refers to the actual body of Polyneices, soon to come into clearer view. If Barlow and I are correct about this passage, and "the techniques of painting are in Euripides' mind,"[101] then I offer the following translation that takes these matters into account: "I do not see him exactly clearly, but I do see some form emerging that resembles his torso as if in relief." In this interpretation we should think of the illusionistic relief implied by a well-drawn figure, as epitomized by the skills of a Parrhasios. However, such is the nature of Euripides' images that often a single interpretation fails to do them full justice. In Chapter Four we will revisit this passage from *Phoenican Women* to consider another possible interpretation, which has nothing to do with painting, but rather takes τύπωμα in its more literal sense as sculpted relief.

The art of line, also known as drawing, may shed light on another otherwise obscure Euripidean image. At *HF* 1118 we encounter an extraordinary usage of a verb, ὑπογράφω, in fact, its only occurrence in tragedy.[102] Having been knocked senseless by a stone hurled by Athena to prevent further carnage, Heracles awakens with renewed sanity, only to confront his father and the grim news of his murderous rampage. Heracles prods a weeping and distracted Amphitryon for an explanation of the present circumstances; fearing the worst, he couches his feelings of dread in unusual terms: εἴπ' εἴ τι καινὸν ὑπογράφῃ τὠμῷ βίῳ ("Tell me if you are about to reveal [literally, "sketch out"] some new thing that will change my life"). The verb ὑπογράφω has a number of meanings, mostly technical, one of which has specific artisanal significance, "trace in outline, sketch out."[103] Struck and apparently mystified by Euripides' choice of the verb, Paley cautions that "so little is known of the true meaning of this rare verb … It is perhaps a metaphor from painting, meaning 'to give an outline sketch' "; he compares Aeschylus, *Libation Bearers* 209: τενόντων θ' ὑπογραφαί, which he translates "the outline of the sole of the foot."[104] Willamowitz-Moellendorff, in his commentary on this "singular expression," points to two separate and seemingly contradictory lines of development of the meaning of ὑπογράφειν, one, as a kind of synonym for ὁρίζειν, which would imply sharpness, clarification, and completeness, and the second, in the true sense of "sketch," as indicating a *lack* of

[101] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 59.
[102] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 351–352; cf. *TLG*, s. v.
[103] LSJ, s. v. ii, 2.
[104] Paley^2 3, p. 83.

definition, differentiation, and completion. (This would mirror our own use of the word "outline," first, to suggest something with a very definite boundary, and second, to indicate the working beginnings of something which remains to be completed.) Willamowitz prefers the latter sense for ὑπογράφω at *HF* 1118, citing ἡνίζω at v. 1120 in support.[105]

The Byzantine scholar Photius (s. v., ὑπογράφεται) glosses: δείκνυται (Naber, 2. 245; cf. *TLG*), which implies that all traces of the artisinal underpinnings of the verb have been lost. However, the craft origins are clearly intact and exploited in the rather frequent appearances of the verb and its cognates in a writer who is but a couple of generations younger than Euripides, Plato (e.g., *R.* 501a, 504d, 548d; *Laws* 803a, 934c), strongly suggesting that they must be incorporated into any interpretation of the Euripidean passage.[106] The term also occurs in a technical capacity in a mid-fourth century BC inventory of the temple of Hera at Samos, in a tally of several linen items, one of which is described as: σπληνίσκον ὑπογεγραμμένον ἱππέ[α]; LSJ (s. v. ὑπογράφω, ii, 3) translates the verb: "with an outline sketch (of a horseman) upon it."[107] With the use of the verb at *HF* 1118, a sketch is not preparatory drawing or draft but rather an *underdrawing*, that is, a drawing made under (ὑπό) a painting, in order to facilitate the execution of the painting. Preserved examples of such sketches have been found in the House of the Labyrinth and the House of the Small Fountain at Pompeii.[108] Aristotle (*GA* 743b24) clarifies how the term is used of the painterly process: οἱ γραφεῖς ὑπογράψαντες ταῖς γραμμαῖς οὕτως ἐναλείφουσι τοῖς χρώμασι τὸ ζῷον ("Painters first draw an outline sketch in preparation to paint in the figure with colors"). At Plato's *Republic* 500e–501c, in an elaborate simile for how the philosopher-kings might go about creating the perfect city, that is, like a painter, ὑπογράφω is used interchangeably with διαγράφω

---

[105] Willamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 1, pp. 233–234; the last observation suggested to the author that v. 1120 should precede v. 1118; as, e.g., Kovacs, *Euripides*, 3.

[106] Cf. Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 588, who is adamant about respecting the technical sense of the term in any interpretation of *HF* 1118, arguing that the concept behind the image would have been familiar during a time period in which art (esp. painting, I would add) was in a "high-blooming" phase and "sketches were needed everywhere."

[107] Charles Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques* (Brussels, 1900), no. 832, line 24 (*SEG* 45 [1995] 1163).

[108] For illustrations and an account of how underdrawings functioned in the preparation of a mural painting, see Roger Ling, "Wall and Panel Painting," in *Making Classical Art. Process & Practice*, ed. Roger Ling (Stroud, Gloucestershire, and Charleston, SC, 2000), pp. 56–58, with figs. 30–31.

to refer to the graphic stages that precede the application of colors in a painting, the finished product (as distinguished from the preparatory drawing) called properly ἡ γραφή at the simile's conclusion.[109]

To interpret ὑπογράφω at *HF* 1118 while preserving some sense of the verb's essential artisanal significance remains a challenging task. Kurtz's explanation perhaps adheres too closely to the concept of "outline;" however, his proposition that the tears and the staggered hints by Amphitrion seem, to Heracles, like an outline drawing whose details are to be filled in slowly, and that, in essence, the father is metaphorically outlining the son's future by informing him of the events of his immediate past, comes close.[110] I prefer to regard a sketch or underdrawing, not as an outline, since it may or may not start out that way, but as a tentative *beginning* of something whose end resides only as an image in the mind's eye of the artist, in its way, as a speculative venture into the unknown. To watch someone sketch is to share an adventure whose outcome is never assured until it arrives; along the way, there are many moments when the spectator may legitimately wonder and fear (along with the artist?) for how it will end. Thus, Heracles, as much as he dreads what he may hear, means to implore Amphitryon at least to *begin* to tell him those things about which the father intimates, that is, exactly what he (Heracles) has done (he has murdered his children), and that Amphitryon should fill in the details later, just as a wall painter makes his *beginnings* by sketching out his entire composition on the surface before he paints it in. Any drawing, whether a preparatory study or an underdrawing for an intended painting, is by nature incomplete; even as it serves its perfectly legitimate purpose, it never attains the polish and level of accuracy of the finished painting. In that sense all drawings are "beginnings," in antiquity, at any rate; the notion that drawings might be regarded as works of art in themselves begins only in the Renaissance.

My interpretation of *HF* 1118 would fit well with Halleran's argument that "partial vision," a concept he borrows from Mastronarde, is exploited nowhere "more fully than in this play." Halleran describes the gradual manner in which Heracles comes to an awareness of his deeds: "First he has only incomplete contact with the stage; then, when he makes fuller contact, he is shocked at what he sees; at last, in conversation with his father he learns of the murders." Something comparable happens to Theseus, too, upon his entrance; Halleran explains how that hero

[109] Cf. *R.* 548c–d; *Plt.* 277c.
[110] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 588.

experiences through "partial vision" the scene he has chanced upon, at first noticing neither the corpses nor Heracles, and only by stages becoming aware of the enormity of the freshly enacted tragedy.[111] I might add that much of this process of recognition is driven by a series of *visual* clues, the stricken father, the dead children, the crumpled hero. The appearance of the uncommon verb ὑπογράφω, instantly putting the audience in mind of paintings, is a reminder that the evidence by which the depth and breadth of this tragedy is revealed will be primarily *visual*. It is well to remember that in Classical Greece the representation of tragedy in myth was not exclusive to the stage; it was also one of the primary subjects of contemporary painting. This was an audience accustomed to sifting mentally through both the verbal and visual sources when presented with a striking image.

Another verb that alludes less directly to the activity of sketching, χαράσσω, is employed by Euripides to characterize the state of Medea's anger toward her estranged husband, Jason, at *Medea* 155–156. The chorus plead with Medea not to let her anger get the best of her: εἰ δὲ σὸς πόσις καινὰ λέχη σεβίζει, / κείνῳ τόδε μὴ χαράσσου ("But if your husband honors some new bed, do not grind your anger at him because of it" or, more colloquially, "do not rub it in"); there is no need for this, as Zeus will take care of all.[112] The primary meaning of the verb is "sharpen (by scraping, hence, "whet"), scratch," but it can also mean, by extension, "engrave, stamp, write, sketch, draw, and so forth."[113] Mastronarde considers this "a rare usage" of the verb (presumably he means in a metaphorical sense), pointing to parallels in Classical authors only at Hdt. 7. 1 and E.uripides, fr. 431 N^2 (now Sophocles, fr. 684 [*TrGF* 4], ταράσσει [χαράσσει, Stob. and ms.]).[114] To make sense of it one should think in terms of the preliminary, potentially rather coarse, activity of scratching out an image on a whitened board as a preparatory study for a painting, or simply as part of the learning process.

---

[111] Halleran, *Stagecraft in Euripides*, pp. 90–91 and 85–86, where his use of "partial vision" is explained and credited to Mastronarde, without further reference; the concept is discussed in reference to *HF* in Donald J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity. Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1979), pp. 22–23.

[112] A less effective but legitimate, and still studio-inspired, alternative might be: "do not brand (or stamp) him with this (lit., this on him)." The reservations of Page, *Euripides Medea*, p. 82, are unnecessary, as the sense is sound.

[113] LSJ, s. v. iii.

[114] Mastronarde, *Euripides Medea*, p. 196; cf. Paley^2 1, p. 87; LSJ, s. v. i, 3.

A useful comparison is provided by the *hapax* σκαριφησμοῖσι ("scratchings") at Ar. *Ra.* 1497, which scholia (Dindorf 1838, IV, pars II, ad loc. *Ra.* 1545) explain as a reference to an artist's preliminary drawing, with the verb σκαριφήσασθαι indicating work done perfunctorily (ἐπισεσυρμένως) and "not with proper accuracy" (μὴ κατὰ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀκρίβειαν). Contrast the more polished underdrawing of *HF* 1118, as interpreted above, which would not be "scratched," but either brushed or, if a cartoon were used, powdered. This is not to say that sketches on whitened boards could not also be brushed, but rather that one type of sketching, that is, the most preliminary, would more likely be scratched than brushed, to conserve color; that χαράσσω is used of sketching supports this. The unpleasant sounds which might accompany such a manner of sketching may be compared to one of the most ingratiating sounds of the modern era, fingernails scratching a chalkboard, evocation of which has become a cliché for the most offensive degree of personal abrasiveness. Similarly this type of sketching was likely regarded as an unwelcome activity by virtue of being accompanied by a sound that grates on the nerves, giving rise to the metaphorical sense of "abrasive" and its cognates. If my interpretation is correct, this studio-inspired image meshes well with the harsh nature of Medea's feelings toward her philandering husband; his behavior has, after all, abraded her, and she would have good reason to return the favor. The image so read is intensified when a similarly inspired verb appears metaphorically for "shatter" or "destroy" at *Med.* 164: διακναίω ("to scratch, wear away"), used by Medea to describe the fate she wishes on the new couple and their place of residence.

Vase-painting

While draftsmanship was an important technical skill for the ancient monumental painter, it was but one among many areas of expertise that were indispensable to his practice. In the case of vase painting, on the other hand, graphic (that is, linear drawing) skills were essential to his artistry. While we have developed a habit of referring to both media as "painting," the designation inordinately flatters the decorator of Greek vases, no matter how accomplished the pictorial sensibilities on display. The two activities, which always had little in common, had drifted even farther apart by the late fifth century BC, when developments in free painting reached far beyond what could be accomplished solely with line and minimal wash, basically, the ingredients of watercolor, with which

the typical red-figure vase painter worked. The distinction between what a wall painter does and what a vase painter does, in other words, the distinction between painting and drawing, at the end of the fifth century is made clear by Aristophanes at *Women at the Assembly* 996. As Keuls has noticed, there the activity of painting white-ground funerary lekythoi is referred to as ζωγραφέω (the term used of free painters) rather than γράφω (the term by the vase painters themselves when they signed their products), "indicating that [Aristophanes] associates this craft with the art of the painter rather than that of the ceramic artist."[115] The newly developed white-ground technique indeed permitted a much wider range of visual effects on vases than ever before, effects which more closely approximated the capabilities of wall painting than did either the black or the red-figure technique; this is evidently what Aristophanes has in mind. However, white-ground vessels represented but a fraction of the market, limited almost exclusively to funerary use; red-figure remained the dominant vase-painting technique throughout the Classical period.

Other signs of the ideological distinctions and disparity of status between vase painting and free painting are in evidence: There is no ancient literature on the history of vase painting—in fact, precious few references to it at all—whereas we know that entire histories were written of monumental painting; some of this lost material is preserved in Pliny. Philipp has pointed out that the only mention of a piece of painted pottery in Greek poetry, a Panathenaic prize amphora, occurs at Pindar, *Nemean* 10. 35–36,[116] another testimony to the lowly status of the craft. By a stroke of fate, however, vase painting is by far the visual art form most often cited, for a variety of reasons, in modern scholarly commentaries and interdisciplinary studies of Euripides' plays. To be sure it is the visual medium most often cited in connection with the works of all of the ancient playwrights. However, Euripides is exceptionally liable to influence other art forms by virtue of his being the most popular of the fifth-century tragedians in later antiquity. There is also a simpler explanation of the inordinate attention paid to vase painting: We have it, whereas wall painting is lost. Classical scholars of all stripes have by now thoroughly canvassed the imagery of Greek vase painting for insights into Euripidean plays, with the philologists looking for ways to shed light on the texts, and the archaeologists using the texts to shed light on the vases, often with mutually beneficial results. With vases the question of which influenced

115 Keuls, *Painter and Poet*, p. 120, n. 39.
116 Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 20.

which is more acute than with the major monumental art forms. Most, I think, would agree that painted vases must have had a considerable impact on Euripides; the same could be said of this playwright's influence on the vase painters and their clients, both during his lifetime and for some time thereafter. It would indeed be surprising if vase painting—of all ancient art media the one most closely associated with everyday life—did not affect a playwright who was reputedly interested in οἰκεῖα πράγματα.

Barlow, as noted above, sees Euripides' choral passages in terms of a metaphor from painting; however, their narrative manner has also been compared with vases, which may actually serve them better.[117] An analogy is fairly easy to make: In Euripides choral songs of what has been termed the "mimetic" variety[118] appear to unfold like a verbal description of visual imagery on a Greek vase. To cite just one example, in the lengthy parodos of *Iphigenia at Aulis* (vv. 164–302, not all of which may be by Euripides), the women relate their passage from Chalchis to Aulis where they view the idle host of Achaean ships and their leaders passing the time in various activities on the shore, which they then describe one by one.[119] Barlow calls this parodos a "display-piece" that is "characteristic of Euripides' lyric style at its most decorative."[120] In typical Euripidean fashion the timeless attitude of the imagery recounted and the steady, literal, paratactic narration of events brings to mind the activity of slowly walking around an actual object while simultaneously characterizing its figural decoration. This action would be better suited to vases with their continuous shapes than to the finite pictorial field of wall or easel painting. Such is the ekphrastic manner adopted by Keats in his 1819 "Ode on a Grecian Urn," not incidentally itself probably inspired by

---

[117] In a discussion of the color and imagery of E.'s choral songs, Kranz, *Stasimon*, pp. 242–244, draws some general comparisons with contemporary works of visual art, including vases.

[118] Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, p. 101, with n. 17; Halleran, *Stagecraft in Euripides*, pp. 68 and 78, n. 41, both following the terminological distinctions between "mimetic" and "reflective" established by Jürgen Rode, "Das Chorlied," in *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*, ed. Walter Jens (Munich, 1971), pp. 90–99.

[119] Enough of the ode is certainly by E. to treat it as characteristic of his style. Kovacs, "Toward a Reconstruction," p. 83, following Denys L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 141–147, concludes: "There are good grounds for thinking that the first three stanzas of the parados are by Euripides and the rest by a later hand."

[120] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 20, again cautioning (n. 17) that part of it is "most probably" not by E.

ancient choral odes as much as by Greek vases that the poet actually saw. At the risk of a circular argument I wonder whether Keats (who, unlike Shelley, was not a classical scholar) simply took for granted that Euripides and the other tragedians owed their inspiration in these ekphrastic choral passages to works of art, vases in particular, thereby prompting him to choose a vase as the subject of his own modern essay in the ancient art of ekphrasis. Remarkably, a vase serves as the poet's prompt, even though he had recently seen for the first time and become enamored of the Parthenon frieze (sonnet, "On Seeing the Elgin Marbles," March, 1817).

Aside from a distinctive narrative apparatus and decorative approach to imagery worthy of emulation, vases also offered pretty pictures by the hundreds for the taking, and Euripides was a constant seeker after images. One need not probe very deeply to find examples of vases paintings as potential sources for (or reflections of?) specific Euripidean images. To stay with the choral passage from *IA*, a little scene stands out at in a portion of the parodos almost certainly by Euripides, one in a series of consecutive vignettes related by the chorus of women from Chalchis as they rush to see the sitting army of Achaeans awaiting their embarkation to Troy (vv. 194–198). Outside of the tents, which are brimming with a display of armor (ἀσπίδος ἔρυμα καὶ κλισίας / ὁπλοφόρους, vv. 189–190), forming a striking picture, Palamedes and Protesilaos play at what may be the first ever game of draughts.[121] The two men take pleasure "in the maze-like figures (μορφαῖσι πολυπλόκοις, vv. 196–197) of the stones" as they are arranged and rearranged on the board. This true-to-life vignette has with justification been compared to Exekias' well-known black-figure amphora in the Vatican (Vat. Mus. Gregoriano Etrusco 16757) which shows Ajax and Achilles seated ἐπὶ θάκοις (cf. *IA* 195), playing a board game, a popular scene that has no known literary source and which appears here, as has been claimed, "for the first time in Greek art."[122] It is usually thought that the event takes place during a lull in the

[121] Palamedes was regarded as the game's inventor, at Aulis (Paus. 10. 31. 1); cf. Paley[2] 3, p. 465; John Boardman, "Exekias," *American Journal of Archaeology* 82 (1978), 11–25 (19); Woodford, *The Trojan War*, p. 180, with references in n. 60.

[122] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 20–21, on which, see below. Illustr. Erika Simon, Max and Albert Hirmer, *Die griechischen Vasen* (Munich, 1981), pl. XXV. The quotation is from Boardman, "Exekias," p. 18; cf. Carpenter, *Art and Myth*, p. 200, who also considers the Vatican amphora "the earliest version, probably invented by Exekias in c. 540;" and Woodford, *The Trojan War*, p. 173, with additional references in n. 6. Boardman, "Exekias," pp. 21 and 24, suggests topical issues that might have inspired the theme, whereas Woodford, op. cit., pp. 178–179, with n. 45, considers purely artistic

fighting, but perhaps it is better to situate the painted scene in the context in which Euripides places his two gamesmen, that is, before the war. In Exekias' rendition both heroes have put aside their shields (always, apparently, at the ready), having leaned them against the sides of the tent (actually, the black glazed surface of the pot which frames the scene), but hold their doubled spears ready in their left hands, while they move the gamepieces with their right. Ajax has removed his helmet; it finds itself balanced precariously, but decoratively, atop his shield. The two are completely absorbed in their game. Of Exekias' originality, on full display in this piece, John Boardman has spoken most eloquently: "Heroes and horses … walk like thoroughbreds through a craft devoted too long to workmanlike decoration and often naïve story telling. For the first time the graphic artist can challenge his poet contemporaries, and on similar grounds of observation and feeling." "His warriors and young men with their parents, even when identified as divine …, act a human, everyday scene, with that awareness of the divine in human thought and action which the classical artist was to codify for the tradition of western art."[123]

Exekias' amphora, arguably the most famous and widely admired black-figure vase painting in modern times, may well have been famous and admired already in antiquity, to judge by the numerous copies and imitations that date from the latter half of the sixth through the fifth century BC.[124] Unlike the prototype, some of these even take care to show an irregular pattern of pebbles on the surface of the board, reminiscent of Euripides' μορφαῖσι πολυπλόκοις.[125] No extant literary source describes the event; either the source has been lost to us, or, more likely, this minor Trojan war incident was an invention of the visual artists, perhaps Exekias himself.[126] Boardman's wise admonition against the common assumption that vase painters required literary inspiration is worth quoting:

---

motivations more likely than external stimuli. For a full bibliography on the theme, see Woodford, op. cit., p. 173, n. 3, with a review of the literature on alternative identifications of the game represented on Exekias' amphora and its imitators, pp. 184–185.

[123] John Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases* (New York, 1974) [hereafter cited as Boardman, *ABFV*], pp. 57–58.

[124] The scene, according to Boardman, "Exekias," p. 18, "was repeated on Athenian vases over 150 times in the following half century," the same number cited by Carpenter, *Art and Myth*, p. 200, who illustrates a black-figure example in fig. 300, where both players have removed their helmets, thereby destroying the perfect asymmetrical balance of Exekias' original; cf. the comprehensive list of Woodford, *The Trojan War*, pp. 181–184.

[125] E.g., the "bilingual" example by the Andokides Painter (Boardman, *ARVA*, fig. 2. 1–2).

[126] See note 122, above.

> We have no right, obviously, to assume that an artist is being guided, directly or indirectly, by a written source that survives today (as the Homeric poems); no right, even, to assume that he is being guided by any written source rather than that *Volksvorstellung* which antedates both writing and representational art, which lay closer to the consciousness of the ordinary Greek than any formal expression in written word or image, and which a humble and prolific art, like that of the vase painter, may reflect more truly than other and more important surviving media.[127]

While Boardman concludes that "Exekias could hardly have invented [the gaming scene] himself," and proceeds to search for a contemporary event that might have inspired the image, he does not dismiss the possibility of literary influence entirely. Rather, he cautions that, since the message of the scene can be "read" without the assistance of any literary text, it follows that there need not have been one behind it.[128] Susan Woodford also stresses the lack of literary antecedents but is more confident in situating the impetus squarely within the vase-painter's studio.[129]

Art works may also be inspired by other works of art. There was a late sixth-century sculptural group depicting two boardgame players on the Athenian acropolis, of which a few fragments remain, which could either have served as the impetus for the vase painter, or reflect a common interest in the theme.[130] In any event the absence of literary precedents strongly points in the direction of the visual arts as a source of inspiration for Euripides' vignette. Either *IA* 194–198 or another similar scene of a boardgame in Euripides that is not preserved is parodied by Aristophanes' Dionysos as a line of Euripides at *Frogs* 1400.[131] There, Achilles is one of the players, suggesting that the very scene staged on an Archaic black-figure vase by the greatest master of the technique, Exekias,

[127] Boardman, "Exekias," p. 12.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Woodford, *The Trojan War*, p. 178.

[130] Acr. Mus. 160, 168, 142 (Ernst Langlotz, Walter-Herwig Schuchhardt, and Hans Schrader, *Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis* [1939; repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1969], no. 412); cf. Carpenter, *Art and Myth*, p. 200; Woodford, *The Trojan War*, p. 176, n. 21, with additional references. Boardman, "Exekias," p. 19, with fig. 4, points to an "isolated later version" of the scene on an Attic vase in Berlin which shows the actors, Ajax and Achilles, here with Athena, distinctly on a base; noting that the original sculpture group was destroyed by the Persians and cannot have been known to this "Mannerist" vase painter, Boardman (op. cit., n. 47) calls the image "a deliberate archaism and recollection of a favourite earlier theme, such as is typical of Mannerist work."

[131] The precise line has not been identified in any of the surviving plays or fragments of E., according to Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, p. 368, although *IA* was among the list of possibilities suggested by ancient commentators, who were likewise baffled; cf. Boardman, "Exekias," p. 21.

was also staged by Euripides in another of his plays, if the line is authentic, and if it is not meant to refer to *IA*. Because the line is seized upon for its triviality in Aristophanes' play—the two playwrights are to choose something "powerful and big" (καρτερόν τε καὶ μέγα, *Ra.* 1398) to end their contest—it seems likely that the second scene was also probably a vignette that had little or nothing to do with the action of the play, very like the vignette in *IA*, as Barlow understands it.[132] It is curious and possibly significant that "four" is one of the numbers called out by Achilles in the line as quoted by Dionysos in *Frogs*, and it is also the number inscribed at the mouth of Achilles on the amphora, perhaps another indication that Exekias' version of the scene was still known and admired in the Classical period. The theme did survive in red figure; its popularity never flagged, extending through the fifth century, but without the *gravitas* that accompanied Exekias' original version.[133] Even allowing that the genre vignette might have a lost literary precedent somewhere in the epic cycle, it remains that the scene lent itself especially well to the decoration of vases, most especially to amphorae, and that, rather than an obscure literary passage that did not survive antiquity, is the form in which it was best known in Euripides' day.

Barlow, with her keen and trustworthy eye for the visual element in Euripides, also finds the Exekian image applicable to *IA* 194–198.[134] Characterizing the many lovely pictures of the parodos, Barlow sees a "visual idiom [that] is reminiscent of certain treatments of similar themes in art," including the Exekias amphora and additional vase paintings; she stops short, however, of suggesting that these late Archaic art works or something like them served as direct sources of inspiration for the playwright, as I suspect they are. Barlow's comparative analysis is ingenious:

---

[132] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 20–21: "In the *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, the Greek camp at Aulis is relevant, in the sense that this is the location of the stage set, but many of the figures the chorus describe, such as Protesilaus, Palamedes, Diomedes and the Ajaxes, have no importance as characters in the pot."

[133] E.g., Boardman, *ARVC*, fig. 200, a rather ugly version by the Hephaistos Painter, a Mannerist hack working in the second half of the fifth century, though not without interest, as it appears to show the players and Athena on platforms, as if they are statues (see n. 130, above); and Martin Robertson, *The Art of Vase-Painting in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), fig. 67, an uninspired rendition by the otherwise talented Berlin Painter. Cf. Woodford, *The Trojan War*, p. 174, with n. 8, and p. 176 on the decline in quality: "None of the artists who enthusiastically took up the theme seems to have appreciated the elegance of Exekias' representation."

[134] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 20, with n. 21, from which the following quotations are drawn.

She describes the "careful positioning of words" which creates a sense of an actual spatial environment in which the objects are deployed. In the vignette of the warrior/gamesmen, Barlow sees an almost Horatian sensitivity toward the appearance of words on the page: "The 'actual' positioning is echoed in the order of the words. Πρωτεσίλαον / Παλαμήδεα are placed at either end of the sentence and enclosed between them is the description of the counters and board." Granted *IA* is a script for a performance rather than a self-sufficient written text, where these kinds of conceptualized patterns more typically flourish; however, relationships such as these could have been heard even if they could not be seen. Taking up Barlow's cue I would add that the verb, in the form of the participle, ἡδομένους, appears exactly at the midpoint between the two proper names, with the remainder of the significant genre details (the seats, the stones, the maze-like patterns) evenly divided and arrayed around it.[135] The perfect balance of the verbal design would be a match for the perfect balance of Exekias' graphic rendition, were the latter not matchless. Even the genre detail that lends Exekias' design an asymmetrical touch (we tend to forget that asymmetry is also balance), Ajax' removed helmet, is echoed in the Euripidean vignette by the final ϑ' after Palamedes' name.

Another potential candidate for influence from vase painting, again in a choral passage, is the vivid picture conjured at *Hecuba* 905–952. The chorus of Trojan women, as they gaze upon the dead body of the young Polydorus in their tent, recall what they were doing at the precise moment when the Greek army inaugurated the final sack of their city. The account is valuable alone for the substantial glimpse into private life that it offers. The women reminisce about their nightly ritual of preparations for bed, about their husbands already asleep beside them, with the men's armor hanging on the walls, about arranging their hair before a mirror, as they sit in their dressing gowns. Barlow, again, has called attention to the similarities in quality between the intimate, picture-like interior scenes portrayed in this choral song and "the quiet, domestic kind of interior scenes represented on white lekythoi or on red-figure vases of the mid-fifth century."[136] She also compares *Tr.* 551–560, noting of both

---

[135] Cf. Paley[2] 3, p. 465, who observes of ἡδομένους: "This plural participle must refer to the proper name following as well as to that preceding. This has been called 'schema Alcmanicum.'"

[136] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 31, with n. 58; cf. Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, p. 179, citing Helen H. Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven, 1961), p. 126.

of these choral passages that Euripides, "by taking the Trojan war into the bedroom," follows through on his decision to portray the sacked city as seen through the eyes of the city's women.[137]

With themes like these, we would not necessarily infer influence, since both art forms are to some degree drawing upon real life, but for a suggestive "Morellian" detail at *Hec.* 920: a reference to "a spear on a peg" (ξυστὸν δ' ἐπὶ πασσάλῳ), caught by Barlow, of course, who points out that interior scenes are frequently indicated on Greek vases by the hanging of objects on a wall.[138] This standard trope can be seen on two famous red-figure vases (albeit featuring subjects well outside of the world of women), a cup by the Brygos Painter in London (BM E 68), which depicts a symposium in progress, and the namepiece of the Foundry Painter, a cup in Berlin showing the interior of a bronze-working studio (Staatliche Museen 2294); numerous additional examples could be cited.[139] Barlow calls the degree of visual detail, especially in the *Hecuba* passage, "strikingly new for tragedy," and "a powerful way of presenting the horror of the Greek attack."[140] The overview of the non-events of female daily life is reminiscent of the *Phaethon* dawn-song, in that the very ordinariness of the activities becomes significant by comparison with the profound changes which are taking place as the chorus give voice to their song. In *Hecuba* this poignancy is even more heavily charged; the once taken for granted but now cherished routine will never be repeated for these captives. There may be a direct correlation between such intimate scenes and an increased interest among contemporary Classical vase painters in depicting the lives of women.[141] Whether this new subject area for vase painters is directly reflected in the Euripidean choral passages or, alternatively, the playwright and the painters are both responding to a change in the social conditions of women or in male attitudes towards them, cannot be known for certain.

In another genre vignette reminiscent of scenes found frequently on Attic vases, at *Electra* 55–56, the heroine makes her entrance bearing a

---

[137] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 31.

[138] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 141, n. 58, citing white-ground examples.

[139] Boardman, *ARVA*, figs. 253 and 262.

[140] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 31.

[141] For the phenomenon, see Boardman, *ARVC*, p. 219, with illustr. examples. For the vases in question, the work of John H. Oakley is essential, e.g., most recently, *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: The Evidence of the White Lekythoi* (Cambridge, Eng., 2004). See also Ferrari, *Figures of Speech*, passim.

jar atop her head in which to fetch water (τόδ' ἄγγος τῷδ' ἐφεδρεῦον κάρᾳ / φέρουσα πηγὰς ποταμίας μετέρχομαι, "bearing this bucket sitting on my head, I make my way to the watery source"), a reflection of her self-imposed slave-like status (vv. 57–58).[142] The actor playing Electra presumably was forced to learn how to balance a hydria on his head, a task normally performed by women! Of the unusual use of the participle ἐφεδρεῦον to mean "sitting, or resting, on," Denniston observes: "here only in this sense."[143] It is as if Euripides were looking for the most potent verbal match to describe what the audience could see for themselves, the placement of the jar; "sitting" conveys both the impression of improbable balance, as if the object were there of its own accord, and the physical weight of the cumbersome, unwieldy object. We are confronted with an engaging momentary picture, an otherwise unremarkable vignette that could be observed daily in real life, as even today in the rural areas of many countries, and it might be left at that. However, it happens that imagery of this nature appears with great frequency in black-figure vase painting, less so in red-figure, most commonly on the appropriate shape, the hydria, itself.[144] Even if, as the evidence indicates, fountain scenes were not overly popular on the vases of Euripides' day, Electra's entrance could simply reflect the new attention to women's daily lives in Classical vase painting that we have already noted. Men, also, on rare occasions, are shown performing this task on vases, and conspicuously on the Parthenon north frieze.[145] The last mentioned offers a clue as to why men would be shown engaging in activities more closely associated with women, and slave women at that; on the frieze it is clearly done for ritualistic or religious purposes.[146] The chorus of Trojan women envision themselves as slaves drawing water at the fountain of Pirene at Corinth at *Tr.* 205–206.

---

[142] Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 103: "not just a 'built-in stage direction'; Eur. alludes to El.'s entrance in A. *Cho*. with a jug of libations for Ag."

[143] Denniston, *Euripides Electra*, p. 59; cf. LSJ, s. v. i.

[144] "Dozens of black-figure hydriai and a few red-figure show women with their pots at a fountain," according to Robertson, *The Art of Vase-Painting*, pp. 29 and 80; see fig. 7, a lovely B.-F. example by the Antimenes Painter; cf. Boardman, *ARVA*, p. 217, who adds: "seldom after about 500." For comparison, symposiastic scenes on kraters and Dionysiac imagery on cups may also be considered "shape-appropriate." See also I. Manfrini-Aragno, "Femmes à la fontaine: Réalité et imaginaire," in *L'image en jeu: De l'Antiquité à Paul Klee*, eds. C. Bron and E. Kassapoglou (Yens-sur-Morges, 1992), pp. 127–148.

[145] North Frieze Slab VI, in the Acropolis Museum, Athens (Jenkins, *The Parthenon Frieze*, p. 86).

[146] Cf. Robertson, *The Art of Vase-Painting*, p. 29; for additional examples, see Robertson, op. cit., fig. 21; Boardman, *ARVA*, fig. 248, both red-figure vases.

More contemporary with Euripides, so called "Meidias" vases of the later fifth century, the florid, quickly drawn, sometimes overcrowded efforts of the Meidias Painter and his circle that as a group represent one of the final gasps of the superb draftsmanship that had characterized the red-figure technique for over a century, have also been associated with the playwright.[147] Barlow points to the choral encomium on Athens at *Medea* 824–865. This famous chorus is full of attractive pictures, including an image of a blonde Harmony giving birth to the nine muses and Aphrodite, drawing water from the Cephisus and crowning herself with a flowered wreath, surrounded by *erôti* sitting alongside of Wisdom (Sophia), as idyllic breezes waft over the proceedings. Of the chorus in *Medea* Barlow observes: "Its tone, like those of the prettily decorative Meidias vases, is light and graceful, and its function must surely be to provide relief, to bring, as [Richmond] Lattimore writes, 'a little desired sweetness to a play which will get none from any of its characters.' "[148] Denys Page, however, taking his cue from a scholiastic remark, divines a more serious intent: "This magnificent hymn is intended to divert Medea from her dreadful purpose."[149] The comparison with the unabashedly ornamental Meidian vases is apt; if they did inspire Euripides, then Barlow and Lattimore, rather than Page, are on the right track. Barlow also appropriately compares the "long, static and decorative ode" at *HF* 348–435, discussed earlier, where the chorus describe the labors of Heracles with "a static kind of pictorialism which in itself appears to make the myth merely trivially decorative," with Meidian and other red-figure and white-ground work.[150] Other ekphrastic Euripidean choral passages that seem primarily decorative in nature might also lend themselves nicely, in a general way, to an association with contemporary late

---

[147] The standard monograph is Lucilla Burn, *The Meidias Painter* (Oxford, 1987).

[148] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 36, citing Richmond Lattimore, *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy* (Baltimore, MD, 1958), pp. 118–119; in n. 69 she points specifically to a squat lekythos by the Meidias Painter ("in the manner of Meidias," according to Boardman, *ARVC*, fig. 302; Brit. Mus. E 697), which shows Erôs seated on the shoulders of Aphrodite, with the group surrounded by female attendants personifying abstract qualities (Eunomia, Peitho, etc.). Of the relationship with Attic vases, Page, *Euripides Medea*, p. 133, had shown the way, as Barlow (loc. cit., pp. 142–143, n. 69) acknowledges, by pointing to an Attic white-ground lekythos which shows Erôs and Harmonia together, with names inscribed. See also Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 264, on the feminine, Sapphic qualities of the first half of the "Ode to Athens."

[149] Page, *Euripides Medea*, p. 131, quoting the scholiast's observation at v. 824.

[150] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 37, with n. 72, citing, among others, a hydria depicting Heracles in the garden of the Hesperides (New York, MMA 24. 97. 5).

fifth-century decorative tendencies in vase painting. Rehm has associated the imagery of white-ground funerary lekythoi with Alcestis' imaging of her own death in her opening monody (*Alc.* 244–272), as if she has these vases in mind.[151] Finally, late fifth-century Meidian work might also be referenced in connection with the rooftop scene in *Phoenician Women*, already discussed in connection with free painting, where Antigone, surveying the battlefield, picks out glinting, often metallic details which provide her with a general visual appraisal of the appearances of the armed men.[152] Antigone's impressionistic, sporadic route to apprehending a visual panorama finds its equivalent in the added white and gold, sometimes in relief, applied to the surface of these late red-figure vases to highlight decorative details, without obfuscating the whole.[153]

Vase painting also offers a parallel for a trope found frequently in Euripides to allude to the times of the day: the personification of sun/dawn or moon/night driving a horse-drawn chariot across the sky.[154] Sometimes the personification is winged. It occurs at *Ion* 41 (sun), 82–85 (sun), 122 (winged sun), 1148–1151 (sun and night); *Supp.* 991–994 (sun and moon); *Or.* 1001–1004 (sun, dawn); *El.* 465–466 (sun, with winged horses), 866 (sun); *Ph.* 3 (sun), 1562–1563 (sun); *Hel.* 341–342 (sun); *IA* 156–159 (sun, dawn); fr. 114 (*Androm.*) (night); fr. 540. 7 (*Oed.*) (Austin, fr. 83) (sun); fr. 771. 2–3 (*Pha.*) (sun, dawn); fr. 773. 19–20 (dawn) (*Pha.*); fr. 929 (incer.) (dawn); problematic text, but certain, at fr. 228. 5 (*Arch.*) (Austin, fr. 1) (sun). Ever the realist, even the stabling places for the horses of the sun, west and east, are mentioned at *Alc.* 591–594 and fr. 771. 4–5 (*Pha.*). Personified images of sun, moon, night, and the stars also happen to appear on contemporary vases, sometimes

---

[151] Rehm, *Marriage to Death*, p. 86, specifically mentioning the scene that shows "a woman being taken off to death like a bride being led by her husband," which he discusses on p. 35. Rehm, op. cit., pp. 103–104, also compares the scene at *Med.* 956ff., where the young sons are sent off bearing the fatal gifts for Jason's new bride, as well as the Glaukê dressing scene (*Med.* 1156ff.), with imagery on Attic vases.

[152] The Meidian painters are possibly emulating free painting, as Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 58, with n. 71, making the same connection, also observes. Examples: Boardman, *ARVC*, cover illustr. and fig. 285.

[153] On added clay and gilding on vases, see Beth Cohen, *The Colors of Clay. Techniques in Athenian Vases* (Los Angeles, CA, 2006), pp. 106–148.

[154] On the image of the "Rossen der Sonne," in the Indo-European literary tradition, see Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache*, §§322–323; cf. Ferrari, *Alcman*, pp. 35–37, on the Babylonian tradition of the "path" or "road" of the sky.

with wings on both the personified figures and the horses. A couple of examples will illustrate the type. On a fragment of a hydria by the Coghill Painter in Naples (Naples RC 157), a personified female figure drives a two-horse chariot, while portions of two additional, similarly personified groups, perhaps stars, appear on either side; some of these figures and horses are winged.[155] On the lid of a pyxis by the Lid Painter in London (BM E 1920.12–21.1), three personified groups appear: The sun, driving a four-horse chariot, and night (?), driving a two-horse chariot, while the moon (?) rides "side-saddle" on a single horse.[156] The last is reminiscent of *Or.* 1003–1004, where dawn is μονόπωλον, an apparent *hapax*.[157] Night drives a two-horse chariot at *Ion* 1150–1151, while the stars "keep up" (ὡμάρτει), as if also driving chariots.

While the image, irrespective of the divinity involved, is extremely popular in the visual arts from the late sixth-century on, it is relatively rare in contemporary literature outside of Euripides. The *locus classicus* is *Od.* 23. 243–246, where Athena holds back Eos and her horses to allow Odysseus and Penelope a longer reunion night; it appears frequently in the *Homeric Hymns* (e.g., 2. 63, 88; 4. 68–69; 28; 31; 32), as well as in Mimnermos, fr. 12 (West), which Diggle considers the earliest reference to the chariot of Helios.[158] To my knowledge the image does not appear in either Aeschylus or Sophocles.[159] Barlow considers the image "literary cliché" for describing sunrise and sunset, but cites only Euripidean examples of its use.[160] Contradicting the notion that the trope in Euripides' hands is merely a cliché, the commentary of Willink on *Or.* 1001–1004, who considers the image in light of Anaxagorean

---

[155] Boardman, *ARVC*, fig. 145.

[156] Boardman, *ARVC*, fig. 243; additional examples are illustr. and discussed in Ferrari, *Alcman*, pp. 38–41, with pls. 6–12.

[157] Obelized by Diggle, but not by Murray, *Euripidis Fabulae*, 3; retained by Willink, *Euripides Orestes*; emended to χιονόπωλον by West, *Euripides Orestes*, followed by Kovacs, *Euripides*, 5. For intelligent commentary, see Willink, op. cit., pp. 255–256, who identifies the poetical term as a *hapax*.

[158] Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, p. 79.

[159] Thomas G. Rosenmeyer, *The Art of Aeschylus* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1982), pp. 92–93, notes its absence in A., "in spite of the ample precedent set by the Homeric epic." Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache*, §§ 321–322, lists Euripidean examples only, from the Classical period. Ferrari, *Alcman*, pp. 37–41, points out the prominence of horses and chariots in the visual as well as the literary imagery of the path of sun, but cites and discusses only Euripidean examples.

[160] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 46 and 103.

physics, among other contemporary philosophical developments, is a sobering reminder that we should never underestimate this playwright's intellectual sophistication.[161]

Personified figures of times of the day also frame the action on the east pediment of the Parthenon, where both the sun and the moon, each driving a four-horse chariot, appear as if emerging from the floors at the corners of the pediments, in a wonderfully effective indicator of a time frame for the divine birth of Athena. The iconography itself was already familiar from vases.[162] However, Pheidias' ingenious design solution for spaces which were always challenging to fill with sculpture is itself likely a response to the radical new perspectival devices, with partial figures emerging from behind ground lines, being explored in the work of Polygnotus and his followers. These experiments are reflected in such contemporary vase paintings as the Niobid Crater and the Boston pelike showing Odysseus meeting Elpenor in the Underworld, mentioned above, along with other works of the so-called "Group of Polygnotus," which flourished exactly contemporary with the Parthenon, centered on one of several vase-painters who apparently took the name of the famous free painter.[163] For those who would believe that the image, whether in art or in literature, is merely a cliché, both Pheidias' pediment and the multiple, variegated versions of the trope by Euripides, stand as testimony to its freshness in the second half of the fifth century. Euripides' earliest successes at the City Dionysia correspond exactly with the years of the Parthenon's construction (447–432 BC); no wonder he responded to the radical new design of its pediments by reinvigorating an old trope. Behind all of this are the vases: As to which art form is influencing the other, most likely we have a confluence of popular imagery among the various art forms, perhaps headed up by Pheidias' bold design. However, the coincidence of the numerous appearances of this image in vases, in the east pediment of the Parthenon, and in Euripides, alone of fifth-century dramatists, is hard to explain away.

[161] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, pp. 253–256; cf. W.K.C. Guthrie, *The Sophists* (Cambridge, Eng., 1971), pp. 231–232, who also discusses E.'s relationship with this trope in terms of contemporary philosophical issues.

[162] J.N. Coldstream, "A Theran Sunrise," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 12 (1965), 34–37, with pl. 4, has identified the unprepossessing image on an amphora from Thera dating ca. 670–660 as "the earliest rendering of the rising sungod by a very long margin," and finds it "curiously prophetic" of the east pediment of the Parthenon (p. 36); cf. Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, p. 79, n. 1, from which, the reference.

[163] The standard monograph is Matheson, *Polygnotos and Vase Painting*.

The Portrayal of Character

The play that has most often been associated with Greek vase painting is *Bacchae*, whose singular evocation of the world of Dionysos has its only counterpart, both in vividness and abundance, in depictions on red-figure vases. As Thomas H. Carpenter notes in his monograph, *Dionysian Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens*: "After vase painting Euripides' *Bacchae* is the richest source of Dionysian imagery to survive from fifth-century Athens."[164] The reciprocal relationships between Euripides' play and the iconography of vase paintings with Dionysian themes has proved a particularly fruitful area of recent research.[165] However, with the focus on connections with vases, one aspect of Dionysos in Euripides' play that potentially relates to significant developments in free painting has generally been overlooked. In an examination of the unusually prominent role of spectacle (Aristotle's *opsis*) in *Bacchae*, Helene Foley draws attention to the likelihood that the actor playing Dionysos wears a *smiling* mask, which would be rare, if not unprecedented in Greek tragedy, a thesis which has found support.[166] She points specifically to the language of two lines, *Ba.* 439 and 1021, though she does not discuss them further. They are worth a closer look. At *Ba.* 1021 Dionysos is armed with a "smirking face" (προσώπῳ γελῶντι) as he is instructed by the chorus of maenads to exact the proper punishment of Pentheus. Earlier, as the unresisting deity was "caught" by Pentheus' men to be brought before the young king, his facial character had been characterized at some length; then, too, he had laughed: οὐκ ὠχρός, οὐδ' ἤλλαξεν οἰνωπὸν γένυν, / γελῶν δὲ καὶ δεῖν κἀπάγειν ἐφίετο … ("Not did he go pale, nor even did he change [the color of] his wine-colored cheeks, but laughing, he bid us to bind him and to lead him away …," vv. 438–439).[167] As I see it the multiple

[164] Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery*, p. 104.

[165] E.g., Jennifer R. March, "Euripides' *Bakchai*: A Reconsideration in the Light of Vase-Paintings," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 36 (1989), 33–65; Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery*, esp. pp. 104–118, both with additional references.

[166] Helene P. Foley, "The Masque of Dionysus," (rev. vers.) in Mossman, *Oxford Readings in Euripides*, pp. 342–368 (362) (orig. pub. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110 [1980], 107–133); cf. Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 186; Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 131. While at one time, by his own admission, attracted to the idea, Stephen Halliwell, *Greek Laughter. A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 136–137, with n. 86, a review of the literature on the issue, pro and con, and p. 546, expresses strong doubts.

[167] Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 186, suggests "laugh" rather than "smile" for γελῶν. On the differences, to the Greeks, see Halliwell, *Greek Laughter*, Appendix 1; they do not

ironies of the Dionysian laugh are played out in full between these two descriptions.[168] While the earlier expression was intended to disarm and deflect suspicion, the later one is the smug response of a successful avenger, tinged with the mystery of evil, and better rendered "smirk."

Philostratos (*Im.* 1. 25) associates Dionysos with the personification of Laughter in an ancient painting; however this object is likely to have been a literary invention.[169] Vase paintings do not show a laughing or smiling Dionysos.[170] Granted, in evaluating the evidence one must bear in mind that the range of expressions attainable in the minor art are much more limited than in monumental painting. A plastic mask-like face of Dionysos with a broad smile appears attached to the sides of a red-figure kantharos from the second quarter of the fifth century, attributed to the Foundry Painter, the model being Archaic examples of disembodied faces or masks of Dionysos used for votive or cult purposes.[171] However, it would be risky to try to distinguish this particular smile from the standard Archaic expression and attribute significance to it.[172] I prefer to associate the vivid facial imagery of *Ba.* 438–439 and 1021, not with images of Dionysos on vases, nor even in specific wall paintings, since our evidence is meager, but rather with the general interest in the representation of character (ἦθος) in contemporary painting, a topic introduced earlier in the chapter, to which we may now return. For it is clear that Dionysos' laughing face as portrayed in *Bacchae* is a nuanced, enigmatic, and multivalent creation that accurately reflects the disquieting

---

affect the present argument. For a smiling (μειδιάων) Dionysos, commentators compare *h.Bacch.* 7. 14–15; however, his eyes (ὄμμασι) do the smiling there; see Halliwell, *Greek Laughter*, pp. 137, n. 86, and 521, n. 5, on the ominous nature of the image. S. has the infant Dionysos smiling in fr. 171 (*TrGF* 4), but a smile on a baby's face never needs to be explained, especially one with a drink in hand. For examples of the smiling god in later literature, see Halliwell, op. cit., p. 137, n. 86.

[168] Cf. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 131: "It is an ambiguous smile—here [v. 439] the smile of the martyr, afterwards the smile of the destroyer (1021)." Halliwell, *Greek Laughter*, pp. 133–139, discusses the two passages under present consideration, reaching different conclusions, and analyzes the role of laughter throughout the play.

[169] Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 186.

[170] Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery*, does not discuss these passages in E. *Ba.*, nor does he mention the smile or laugh as part of the god's iconography. A perusal of Carpenter's plates reveals no images of the god that can be distinguished from other figures on the vase as laughing or smiling. Maenads (or Nymphs, according to Carpenter, op. cit., p. 80) do, however, smile broadly on a cup by the early Classical vase painter Makron (Berlin, Staatliche Museen F 2290; Carpenter, op. cit., pl. 21).

[171] J. Paul Getty Museum 88. AE. 150 (Carpenter, *Dionysian Imagery*, pl. 39b); on the disembodied face, see Carpenter, op. cit., p. 97.

[172] Cf. Halliwell, *Greek Laughter*, p. 546.

character and behavioral patterns of this most mystifying god. It is as if Euripides, whose portrayal of the ambivalent and ambiguous character of Dionysos is unsurpassed in surviving literature, were searching for a way to represent visually an unusual character true to form and found it through a combination of a rare mask type and language that draws attention to it. In matching the χαρακτήρ (= the smiling mask) to the character, Euripides tries his best to make external appearances conform to internal realities, however unsettling the result.[173]

Euripides' fascination with the representation of character is amply demonstrated by his repeated use of similes and metaphors associated with χαρακτήρ on coins (e.g., *Med.* 516–519; *Hec.* 379–380; *El.* 550–551, 558–559 and 572), a subject that I have treated at length on an earlier occasion, to which the present reader is referred.[174] While he did not originate the coin simile, without a doubt, it gains new vigor and range in Euripides' hands. Moreover, at the height of the fifth century, Euripides had the image virtually to himself. As Pauer has observed, Aeschlylus uses it once, Sophocles not at all, while Euripides, through repeated use, gives it "eine frische Lebendigkeit."[175] The essence of the image is this: An individual expresses regret at the inability to read men's or women's characters from their outward physical appearances and the appurtenances of wealth, just as it is impossible to gauge the value of a coin by its χαρακτήρ ("stamp"), alone: The coin may in fact be fraudulent. In the majority of examples, the presence of technical language associated with coinage leaves no doubt that the metaphor is being deployed. However, in certain circumstances, the image and the idea behind it may be at work even though the technical language itself is absent.

I have in mind, for example, those numerous instances in Euripides where some form of "clear proof" of apparent reality is sought. One such occurs at *Hipp.* 925–931, where Theseus, stung by the false message conveyed by the tablet in the possession of his dead wife, accusing his son of rape, seeks a τεκμήριον σαφές of human character. The imaginative solution to the problem that Theseus subsequently articulates reads as

---

[173] While Halliwell rejects the notion of a smiling mask for Dionysos (see note 166, above), he nonetheless recognizes the physicality of E.'s imagery: "One of the supreme, perpetually challenging paradoxes of the play is that Euripides has superimposed the body language of laughter, divine as well as human, onto the bleakest face of tragedy" (*Greek Laughter*, p. 139).

[174] Stieber, "Coins and Character."

[175] Pauer, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*, p. 158. For the relevant comparanda and further discussion, with secondary references, see Stieber, ibid.

an unusual variation on the coinage theme: He wishes that all men might have two voices, one just and the other of whatever nature it, and presumably its possessor, happen to be.[176] The just voice might then engage in a proper debate (ἐξηλέγχετο) with the unjust, if necessary, revealing its false character, and thereby sparing friends and loved ones an evil man's (in this case, Hippolytus') deceit. Compare the use of the noun ἔλεγχον at *Alc.* 640, where Admetus taunts his father: ἔδειξας εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐξελθὼν ὃς εἶ ("You showed who you are when put to the test"). An equally ingenious scheme is entertained by the chorus of *Heracles* in the first antistrophe of the second stasimon (vv. 655–672), a paean to youth. There, sure marks of quality in men are sought once again, this time, by means of language directly associated with coinage. Youth is so precious, the chorus of old men sing, that, as a sure mark (φανερὸν χαρακτῆρ') of *aretê*, the gods might consider bestowing a second round of it on those individuals of worthy character. (The life of Heracles, who has returned from the dead and ultimately shall enjoy a "second" life with a new wife, underlies the sentiment.[177]) The chorus reason that, by this mark, that is, the second youth, mortals could tell good specimens from bad. They reluctantly conclude that this is not the case and that there is no clear standard (ὅρος σαφής) conferred by the gods by which mortals may reliably distinguish the wheat from the chaff in their fellows. A lengthy human life, such as it is, is not a dependable indicator of goodness; it has nothing to show for itself but increased wealth.

Euripides often draws attention to the profound depths of the body in which character traits were thought to be preserved. Hidden away from public scrutiny in places to which access must be earned by the prospective infiltrator, these repositories and their contents mirror the status of coins, whose essence, true or false, lies well beneath the sculptured surface. At *Med.* 659–661, just before the entrance of Aegeus, the chorus of Corinthian women lament the fate that has befallen Medea on account of Aphrodite's cruel whims. Medea has not been served well by her φίλοι, whom the sympathetic chorus condemn with the following generalizing axiom: ἀχάριστος ὄλοιθ' ὅτῳ πάρεστιν / μὴ φίλους τιμᾶν καθαρᾶν / ἀνοίξαντα κλῇδα φρενῶν ("May he perish without grace,[178]

[176] On how this comes to pass in the course of the play, see Rabinowitz, *Anxiety Veiled*, p. 178.

[177] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 232; Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 153.

[178] Translating ἀχάριστος in a predicative sense; *contra*, Mastronarde, *Euripides Medea*, p. 281.

he who fails to honor his friends by having opened up the bolts that bar access to his pure mind"). A pure, honest mind lies deep within and, it seems, incapable of easy admittance, locked and bolted, with reason, against the unworthy. With the deserving few, however, the good man is obliged to share the fullness of his goodness; indeed not to do this is a violation of his obligations to his friends and family members. The secret nooks and crannies of one's entrails, whose complex multitudes lie folded neatly and compactly within the relatively small space of the human torso, are considered the repositories for the truest aspects of him or herself that one human being may, or may not, present to another. Hence, the metaphor of "unfolding" is often employed in imagery of this type.[179] This is the basis upon which Andromache refuses to "unfold her heart" (ἀναπτύξω φρένα) to her current husband, Neoptolemus, on the grounds that she would betray Hector, the man for whom she was truly φίλη and thereby was owed the knowledge of her finest mental and emotional assets (*Tr.* 661–663).[180] The metaphor of unfolding the good and the true, and vice versa, may be extended to inanimate or abstract things as well, as when the impressive (καλός) argumentation of Theseus, when "unfolded" (εἴ τις διαπτύξειεν), that is, examined closely, may be revealed to be not particularly fine (καλός, again), according to his son (*Hipp.* 984–985).[181]

Preserving one's character traits enfolded within the confines of the breast allows a bad "host" ample time to effect dishonorable deeds before his or her true nature is discovered, and a good one, a grace period in

---

[179] Cf. Ruth Padel, *In and Out of the Mind. Greek Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton, 1992), pp. 13–14, on the *splanchna* as the source of one's deepest moods, thoughts, and feelings. The *phrenes* were also storage areas; on the metaphor of the writing tablet of the mind which devolves from such imagery, see Deborah T. Steiner, *The Tyrant's Writ. Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 105–109, who suggests that the metaphorical unfolding activities "mimic the larger action that structures the drama, the opening and closing of the door in the stage building or *skênê* used by actors to change their costumes between episodes" (p. 108). M.L. West, *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 561–562, traces such metaphorical uses of writing-tablet imagery back to the Old Testament and other ancient Near Eastern sources. On how the folded tablet functions as a corollary to the body of a woman, see Steiner, op. cit., pp. 110–116, and specifically in E. *Hipp.*, Froma I. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other. Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature* (Chicago and London, 1996), pp. 245–246.

[180] Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 271, denies, however, that there is any of the original sense "entfalten" preserved in the metaphor.

[181] Cf. S. *Ant.* 709, where pompous and self-important individuals, when opened up like a writing tablet, are revealed to be empty inside (οὗτοι διαπτυχθέντες ὤφθησαν κενοί).

which to weigh the worthiness of the individual who seeks right of entry. It also allows each in turn a period of time in which to assess the exigencies of a particular situation calling for a deployment of character before deciding on a course of action. In other words this principle of "storage" can forestall action, as often as not a good thing. It also keeps interlopers guessing about the nature of the contents, so to speak. After the revelation of the contents and the inevitable assessment of their quantity and quality which follows, the individual standing in judgment, may be pleased or disappointed, either way, disabused of his or her prejudices, as at *Med.* 219–221: δίκη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν, / ὅστις πρὶν ἀνδρὸς σπλάγχνον ἐκμαθεῖν σαφῶς / στυγεῖ δεδορκώς, οὐδὲν ἠδικημένος ("For there is no justice in the eyes of mortals, when someone, before he learns clearly the true character of a man, hates on sight, though he has not been harmed").

These images of folding and unfolding, the disclosure of qualitative and quantitative fullness that lays character bare, and the potentially ambiguous nature of external appearances or χαρακτήρ as a reflection of the folded contents, inevitably bring to mind Plato's *Symposium* 215b and 216d–e. There, Alcibiades compares Socrates to a curious type of layered, Russian-doll-like figurine, thus far undocumented by archaeology, that takes the outer form of an elderly satyr, Silenus, but when split in half is revealed to have *agalmata* of the gods tucked inside. For Socrates happened to look satyr-like on the exterior. Within, however, as Alcibiades tries to explain to those symposiasts who have never seen inside the great man, the hidden "*agalmata*" are "divine and golden and exquisite and wondrous" (θεῖα καὶ χρυσᾶ εἶναι καὶ πάγκαλα καὶ θαυμαστά, 216e). Vitruvius is probably aware of this feature of the Socratic legend when, in his preface to Bk. 3 on temples, he begins by pointing out that Socrates is reported to have expressed the wish that men's chests could have windows through which others might literally inspect their thoughts. By Vitruvius' day ideas like these had been swirling around Socrates for some time, to the point of having become virtual clichés to serve many purposes. In Vitruvius' case he finds the image useful as a clever and colorful analogy for the secretive nature of many craftsmen, who "hide their knowledge within their breasts" (obscuratis sub pectoribus ingeniis[182]), thereby depriving other professionals of valuable expertise. Chests do not have windows, of course, and humans, like Alcibiades, are forced to

[182] Text: Frank Granger, *Vitruvius on Architecture*, 1 (1931; repr. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1998).

earn the right of access to the depths in which good character resides, to the real selves of those rare individuals who are more worthy than the rest.

All of this relates ultimately to the larger and more wide-ranging question of the nature of the relationships between appearances and reality that preoccupied the fifth century, the age of the Sophists.[183] While these questions would only be fully explored later in the works of Plato and Aristotle, that Euripides engaged them repeatedly throughout his corpus needs no arguing. More specifically, however, the ideas behind the coin simile and related imagery may be connected with an ancillary issue, the representation of character in art, which, to judge from the number of literary references to it, stimulated general intellectual interest in the second half of the fifth century.[184] For Euripides' career-long attention to the problematic notion of physical aspect as a mirror of inner character coexists alongside a landmark fifth-century development in monumental painting: Earlier in the century the mural painter Polygnotus first specialized in the depiction of human *êthos* (Arist. *Po.* 1450a25–29; *Pol.* 1340a35–38) which became the norm later in the century when the painter Parrhasios was quizzed by Socrates at length in his studio on the representation of physical states of emotions and inner character by the artist, a conversation preserved in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (3. 10. 3–5), to which we shall turn presently.[185]

One must bear in mind that, while all of the mimetic art forms are concerned with character in one way or another, the *representation* of character is properly the domain of the visual arts. While we may and do speak of the "representation" or "portrayal" of character in literature, when we do so, we adopt this language only in a figurative sense. Certainly, from Homer onwards verbal artists aimed in some degree to delineate character in individuals, mortal and divine; there could be no stories

[183] The topic is obviously a large one and out of my immediate reach; see, e.g., Guthrie, *The Sophists*, esp. pp. 186–188 and 200. In brief: Socrates was on the side of "reality," laying stock in the (eventual) world of absolute Platonic forms, while the Sophists, most notably Protagoras, placed their faith in the temporary world of "appearances."

[184] Cf. Stephen Halliwell, *The Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton and Oxford, 2002), pp. 122–123, who does not, however, mention the coin metaphor. Steiner, *Images in Mind*, pp. 125–134, discusses how statues are used in fifth-century literature as a means for articulating the ways in which external appearances can mislead about inner reality, as men tend to interpret phenomena according to the former.

[185] Pl. *Laws* 655 and Arist. *Pol.* 1340a also deal at length with the representation of character in the arts.

otherwise. The useful notion that character is visually evident also goes back to Homer, where the matter was, for the most part, reduced to a simple one-to-one formulaic correspondence: The good are beautiful, the beautiful are good, while the opposite can be counted upon, as well. This too simplistic equation was challenged as early as the lyric poets (e.g., Archil. fr. 114 [West]; cf., e.g., Euripides fr. 842 [*Chrys.*]), presumably motivated by the observation that, in real life, beauty of body and beauty of soul by no means always, and perhaps even seldom, coincide (as would be the case with both Socrates *and* Alcibiades, at a later date). By the fifth century, more satisfying solutions were being investigated, and the representation of character came to be of interest. In this, the help of the artists was naturally sought. Turned over to the philosophers, who enlisted the assistance of the original artist, nature, the solution of the representation of character would eventually develop into a pseudo-science, the full-fledged physiognomic theory of the fourth century, to which the artists themselves would then turn for guidance. The formative stages of this theorization process, however, may be traced in the art and literature of the fifth century.

The portrayal of character by contemporary painters may also be on Euripides' mind in a remark he gives to Antigone at *Ph.* 127–130, which occurs during a passage that we have already associated with more technical developments in the art form. When the impressive figure of Hippomedon is identified for her, Antigone is alternately repulsed and fascinated by his demeanor (ὡς γαῦρος, ὡς φοβερὸς εἰσιδεῖν ["How haughty, how fearsome to look upon"], v. 127). She observes that he seems not of the human race of her own day, but instead "like to an earth-born giant" (γίγαντι γηγενέτᾳ προσόμοιος, v. 128). Antigone must be able to see Hippomedon's face quite well, since she notes its *terribilità* as well as its "star-bright" quality (ἀστερωπός, v. 129).[186] As with Ion, Hecuba, and Hippolytus, in passages discussed earlier, Antigone too reveals that she owes to paintings her knowledge of the physical appearance of the race of giants, when she adds, almost parenthetically, that the last feature of Hippomedon's face is "just as in the paintings" (ἀστερωπὸς <ὥσπερ> ἐν γραφαῖσιν, vv. 129–130).

---

[186] Cf. Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 189. Paley² 3, p. 125, associates the epithet ἀστρωπός (Dindorf's correction of ἀστερωπός) with Hippomedon's shield device; however, Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae*, p. 85, wisely considers such an interpretation "untenable."

The textual issues raised by the harsh hyperbaton of ἐν γραφαῖσιν, which we should expect to be in attributive position with γίγαντι, if we read this simile correctly, are numerous; Diggle's ὥσπερ is intended to alleviate the problem.[187] Alternatively we might have expected ἀστερωπός to be in the dative, modifying γίγαντι, if that epithet is the point of comparison which fuels the simile. But perhaps it is easier to take all three nominative epithets, γαῦρος, φοβερός, ἀστερωπός, as indicative of what makes Hippomedon look, to Antigone's eyes, like a giant in paintings. The allusion, as commentators have agreed, is to representations of the Gigantomachy, which can be found in all media in Greek art of all periods.[188] However, the use of ἀστερωπός (literally, "star-faced") of a depicted giant has puzzled some. Mastronarde is on the right track when he interprets the epithet as "with dazzling visage," noting correctly that while "there is nothing particularly star-like" about giants in Greek art, "in a painting the facial expression is an obvious tool for conveying savagery, and brightness of glance is associated with the ability to inspire terror in [terms such as] γοργός, γοργωπός, μαρμαρωπός, etc."[189] Indeed the last two adjectives are appropriately used of Heracles' children's faces, compared with their father's, at *HF* 131 (γοργῶπες) and of Heracles himself at *HF* 883 (μαρμαρωπός).

In an effort to shed further light on Antigone's remarks and, more importantly, Euripides' intentions, let us now look more closely at the passage from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* mentioned above (3. 10. 3–5), which records a conversation between Socrates and the painter Parrhasios that took place in the latter's studio. Whether this exchange actually occurred or not is irrelevant; if it did not, then it would have had to be invented, since the ideas it dramatizes are obviously topical. I reproduce this important and often cited text from the Loeb Classical Library edition and translation by E.C. Marchant,[190] with some words that might prove significant for the present given also in Greek:

---

[187] Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae*, p. 85; a clearer, fuller discussion of this "very difficult" passage may now be found in Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, pp. 187–189. I agree with Mastronarde (op. cit., p. 187, n. 1) that Craik's, *Euripides, Phoenican Women*, p. 178, "in outline" is not justified; perhaps she is thinking of *Ph.* 161–162.

[188] Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae*, p. 85; Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 189. The simile at *Il.* 22. 26, where a charging Achilles is likened to a rising star, has also been associated with the image (Pearson, loc. cit.).

[189] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 189.

[190] E.C. Marchant and O.J. Todd, *Xenophon*, 4 (1923; repr. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1979).

[S.] "Well now, do you also reproduce the character of the soul (ἀπομιμεῖσθε τῆς ψυχῆς ἦθος), the character that is in the highest degree captivating, delightful, friendly, fascinating, lovable? Or is it impossible to imitate that?"

[P.] "Oh no, Socrates; for how could one imitate that which has neither shape nor color nor any of the qualities you mentioned just now, and is not even visible (ὅλως ὁρατόν)?"

[S.] "Do human beings commonly express the feelings of sympathy and aversion by their looks (βλέπειν)?"

[P.] "I think so."

[S.] "Then cannot thus much be imitated in the eyes?"

[P.] "Undoubtedly."

[S.] "Do you think that the joys and sorrows of their friends produce the same expression on men's faces (τὰ πρόσωπα), whether they really care or not?"

[P.] "Oh no, of course not: They look radiant (φαιδροί) at their joys, downcast (σκυθρωποί) at their sorrows."

[S.] "Then is it possible to represent these looks too?"

[P.] "Undoubtedly."

[S.] "Moreover, nobility (τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές) and dignity, self-abasement and servility, prudence and understanding, insolence (τὸ ὑβριστικόν) and vulgarity, are reflected in the face (διὰ τοῦ προσώπου) and in the attitudes of the body (διὰ τῶν σχημάτων) whether still or in motion."

[P.] "True."

[S.] "Then these, too, can be imitated, can they not?"

[P.] "Undoubtedly."

In bringing this text to bear upon the topic at hand we must give due regard to the fact that, in Euripides, χαρακτήρ ("character") and ἦθος ("character") are two different things. In Euripides, χαρακτήρ is always the outward mark or sign, ἦθος, the inner quality.[191] One is visible, the other invisible. One is subject to tampering (i.e., as in coinage), the other immutable. Since ἦθος is invisible, we need a reliable χαρακτήρ on the outside of each individual to alert us to the truth of the contents. This nature did not always do. The artist, on the other hand, with a wide

[191] For the evidence, see Stieber, "Coins and Character," pp. 269–271.

variety of representational skills at his disposal, has the discrepancy to accomplish this task. In the *Memorabilia* passage there is no need to mention χαρακτήρ because "character" is equivalent to "imitation of the ἦθος" by the artist. It is well to remember that, when it is used of the works of Polygnotus and other painters known for their skills at portraying it, ἦθος refers as much to the wide-ranging human repertory of temporary states of emotion that result from permanent character traits as much as to those traits, since one's ability to feel and show emotions directly impinges upon the quality of one's character. Thus, even though the technical term for the stamp on a coin is not employed in the exchange between Socrates and Parrhasios, the principle is the same, since we must assume that surface indicators are the signs of *êthos* that the painter has the exclusive capabilities of rendering visible.

We may now resume our discussion of Antigone's remarks aided by the language of the exchange in *Memorabilia*. It is clear that what Socrates means by "looks" are the physical organs of sight, just as our word "looks," while it has come to connote all aspects of physical appearance, has its basis in the eyes. It therefore follows that many of the emotions and character traits mentioned by Socrates and Parrhasios focus on the eyes as the visual centerpieces of human expression, and that the assumption that their particular set or aspect will signal one's character or emotional state, whether as experienced or as observed. That the latter two categories are virtually interchangeable is made clear by Ion's and Socrates' exchange at Plato's *Ion* 535c–e, in which the very same emotions felt *by* Ion and perceived *on* him are mirrored, *mutatis mutandis*, in the audience members, who are δεινὸν ἐμβλέποντας at the rhapsode's inspired recitation of Homer.[192] In Greek ὄψ, ὄψις refer to the eye and its functions as well as to the face, likely based on the principle that the look in one's eye determines for the most part how one "looks." Thus, in Antigone's line in *Phoenician Women*, γαῦρος (which, having both a good and a bad sense, could be viewed as a conflation of something like τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές and τὸ ὑβριστικόν, to compare the language of the Xenophonic dialogue), φοβερός, ἀστερωπός are all to be imagined as readily displayed by the face. As well γαῦρος and φοβερός could be indicated in the carriage of the body (διὰ τῶν σχημάτων, in Xenophon), which Antigone also is able to see. As for how a giant might be depicted in art as γαῦρος, φοβερός, and

[192] In a similar vein, Aristotle (*Pol.* 1340a20–b19) sees the character traits imitable in music inspiring the listener to form those traits.

ἀστερωπός, we might turn to a modern giant, Michelangelo's "David," whose cloudy brow and unruly mane exemplified the *terribilità* for which the artist and his works became famous.[193]

Alternatively the reverse line of influence might be posited, and the concern for depicting character in the fine arts could be owed to the theater, where tragic masks came in a variety of stock expressions and colors.[194] Euripides' interest in the problem might then be attributed to a source closer to home. If this is the case then one could legitimately argue that the range of physiognomic traits observed by Antigone in *Phoenician Women* and the nuanced expressions of Dionysos in *Bacchae* are merely self-referential. This conclusion, however, while perhaps the more obvious, is problematic in that it depends directly on the controversial question of whether in practice masks could be changed during the course of a play to reflect emotional responses to events.[195] Moreover, Euripides' insertion of an unmistakable clue, ἐν γραφαῖσιν, in Antigone's lines to indicate that he has paintings in mind argues against the likelihood of a metadramatic allusion to masks, in the one instance, at least.

In the end it matters not whether contemporary painting or theatrical attire were the inspiration for the passages from *Bacchae* and *Phoenician Women*, as well as the others presented here. Masks, of course, are but the most honest and most venerable of falsifiers. What matters is that, one way or another, Euripides was looking to contemporary visual arts and crafts for imagery that speaks most powerfully on behalf of his dark, occasionally cynical and always realistic view of the world—in particular, for solutions to the conundrum of "representing" character in real life—as an alternative to the verbal arts, whose solutions the playwright might have deemed too familiar, facile, and, finally, inadequate to the task. The fallibility of coinage, a favorite simile of Euripides', like the fallibility of physical appearances in the reckoning of character in human beings, both facts of life in Classical Athens and beyond, are inescapable. Ultimately the antidote offered by the painters, developing means to depict character through calculated manipulation of facial and bodily configurations, remains a peculiarity of the still, silent world of the visual arts and

[193] Summers, *Michelangelo*, pp. 234–241, collects the ancient sources for the distinctly "terrible" look on the face of the "David" and other works by Michelangelo, a look which eventually came to be associated with the artist, himself.

[194] Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, pp. 191–196.

[195] On the unlikelihood of mask changes, see Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, pp. 173–174. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 95, is insightful regarding the connections between late fifth-century art, character portrayal, and the theater.

cannot be co-opted on the tragic stage, where the merest of movements is recorded and "read" by the eye of the attentive audience member. Thus even the best of painters would have been helpless to prevent or to correct the disasters based upon misjudgment of χαρακτήρ that fuel Greek tragedy, a concession which suggests that, among the mimetic arts that flourished in Classical Greece, in the final analysis, tragic drama offered the nearest approximation of real life.

Ganymede

With so much interest focused on the representation of character during the second half of the fifth century, a *lack* of expression can also assume significance. For our last topic of the present chapter, we return to the Ganymede Ode of *Trojan Women* and an image that, in a less obvious way, also reflects upon the notion of the physical mien of τὸ πρόσωπον as an outward sign of conditions within. Ganymede, the Trojan prince who was abducted as a young boy and carried to Mount Olympus to serve as cupbearer at divine symposia, is chided by the chorus for maintaining his poise by keeping his face—a face whose eternal youthfulness represents a divine gift—"beautifully serene," even as his native city falls: … σὺ δὲ πρόσωπα νεαρὰ / χάρισι παρὰ Διός θρόνοις / καλλιγάλανα τρέφεις ("… but you, beside the throne of Zeus, continue to foster a beautifully serene facial demeanor that is kept youthful through grace," *Tr.* 835–837). The second choral strophe at *Tr.* 821–838, which is addressed directly to Ganymede, begins with μάταν ("in vain"): Clearly the chorus of Trojan women are disappointed that their compatriot did not use his influence to save their city.[196] Burnett has written extensively on the meaning and significance of this beautiful but underappreciated ode, curiously sandwiched between the unspeakable tragedy of Astyanax and the "semi-comic" scene of Helen's escape, an exquisite casualty, it would seem, of the episodic format for which *Trojan Women* has been criticized. Burnett, however, develops a careful, compelling argument explaining how and why Euripides has used the choral song to bridge what would otherwise seem an unbridgeable gulf between the two events. Her conclusion,

[196] Cf. Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 217: "Although his city is destroyed, Ganymede continues to serve Zeus faithfully and does not mar the beauty of his countenance with lamentation." Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 313, also emphasizes the irony of the language and imagery.

which summarizes the delicate system of checks and balances pivoting around the Ganymede Ode in a play that is often considered lacking in unity and structure, is worth quoting in full:

> [The gods] have finished their design, and it has a dreadful beauty in spite of the materials they were forced to use. The torch that Hecuba dreamed has set fire to Troy. The war that began with the dubious sacrifice of a Greek girl ([*Tr.*] 370–371) has ended with the hideous killing of a Trojan boy. And the story-tellers' cause, the abduction of Helen by a Trojan prince, has found its exact counterweight in the taking of Apollo's priestess by the conquering Greek king (357–358). The war that was imaged as a kind of rape in the second ode has spawned a multitude of violent couplings (778–779, 780–781), measuring the difference between this world that men create and another that, with the favor of the gods, they might enjoy. It is the difference between the violation of a captive enemy and the rape of a Ganymede.[197]

The world that mortals "might enjoy," should they somehow beat the odds and win the favor of the gods, the world that is the ideological and visual opposite of the one depicted in *Trojan Woman*, is encapsulated in the unusual and highly decorative epithet used of Ganymede's facial expression at *Tr.* 837: καλλιγάλανα. The melodious Greek of this single word, an apparent coinage of Euripides', begs for an equally extravagant, chiastic translation: "serenely beautiful and beautifully serene."[198] What are the sources for the image? Ganymede, in earlier literature, is cited in a formulaic way for his beauty and his fair hair but not for his serene countenance, which presumably appears only after he loses his virginity and becomes cupbearer. Homer (*Il.* 20. 232–235) observes his beauty in three different ways in quick succession (ἀντίθεος Γανυμήδης [v. 232], κάλλιστος [v. 233], κάλλεος εἵνεκα οἷο [v. 235]), but without further ado. The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (5. 202–203) is slightly more informative, telling of his beauty (διὰ κάλλος) and his hair color

[197] Burnett, "*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede Ode," p. 316.

[198] καλλιγάλανα is an apparent *hapax*; cf. LSJ, *TLG*, s. v. Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 200, in a detailed analysis of the imagery of the Ganymede Ode (pp. 198–202), includes καλλιγάλανα in a list of compound epithets that "appear to be inventions of Euripides." Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 315, calls it a "maritime Bildvorstellung." Tyrrell, *The Troades*; Paley^2 1; and Lee, *Euripides Troades*, (all ad loc.), curiously have no comment. Burnett, "*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede Ode," p. 304, calls *Tr.* 835–837 "an extraordinary phrase." The inspiration for the chiasm is St. Bernard of Clairvaux's "deformis formositas ac formosa deformitas" ("deformed beauty and beautiful deformity"), a famous chiasm intended as a criticism of Romanesque sculpture, at *Apologia* 29 (text of Conrad Rudolf, *The* "Things of Greater Importance." *Bernard of Clairvaux's Apologia and the Medieval Attitude Toward Art* [Philadelphia, PA, 1990], pp. 282–283).

(ξανθὸν Γανυμήδεα) as the impetuses for the abduction, and describing him on the job as a θαῦμα ἰδεῖν (v. 205), though without specification. Ganymede, having been borne by Zeus to Olympus and now a daemôn beloved by the son of Kronos, has "the flower of youth" (παιδείης ἄνθος) at Theognis 1348 (West). Pindar also has him, indirectly, by comparison with the boy honoree of the ode, Hagêsidamus, ἰδέᾳ τε καλὸν / ὥρᾳ τε κεκραμένον ("beautiful in form and endowed with youth," *O.* 10. 103–104 [Snell and Maehler]); the use of κίρναμι (= κεράννυμι, "to mix") in association with Ganymede may be considered paronomasia, for the boy was mixer and pourer as well as bearer of the ambrosial meal.[199]

Euripides, on the other hand, is significantly more expansive in his characterizations of the physical demeanor of the Trojan prince in his new life on Olympus. At *IA* 1049–1053 we are treated to an engaging vignette of Ganymede, Διὸς / λέκτρων τρύφημα φίλον ("beloved treasure of the bed of Zeus"), drawing up the liquid refreshment (λοιβάν) in golden cups dipped into the large krater in which it had been mixed, and serving guests at the marriage of Peleus and Thetis. Earlier in the second strophe of the Ganymede Ode, itself, at *Tr.* 821–824 we find him "going lightly, to and fro, among the golden wine pitchers," holding out to Zeus a kylix full of the poured liquid; rather than the boy himself, in a masterful example of transferred epithet, it is his *state of servitude* that is "most beautiful" (καλλίσταν λατρείαν). As if to counter the idyllic treatment he receives in *Trojan Women* and in earlier literature, Ganymede is rather irreverently referred to as the εὐνέτα ("bed-partner") of Zeus by the low-speaking Phrygian slave who provides tragi-comic relief at *Or.* 1391–1392, with the Trojan prince's deflowering by the supreme deity coarsely characterized as ἱπποσύνα ("the riding" or "the mounting").[200] Euripides' allows himself even more irreverence towards the relationship between Zeus and his boy in the fully comic setting of *Cyclops* (vv. 579–589), where a drunken Cyclops grabs a Silenus and wants to turn him into, in

[199] As at E. *IA* 1049–1053 and Ar. *Pax* 724.

[200] For the multiple textual problems associated with *Or.* 1390–1392, which we need not enter into here, see the apparatus of Diggle, who prints ἱπποσύνα, with the mss.; Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 312; West, *Euripides Orestes*, pp. 278–279. ἱπποσύνα, with West and *contra* Willink, locc. cit., not in apposition to Δαρδανία, but "a separate exclamation." We need not force a connection with horses or horsemanship in the case of either Zeus or Ganymede, as commentators have done to make sense of the passage. The term is a perfectly suitable, dare we say apt, description of a common sexual act between two males which is echoed in today's "barebacking" to refer to the same activity, practiced without a prophylactic device. The coarse, irreverent tone would be in keeping with the rest of the Phrygian slave's speech.

the eager satyr's question, "Zeus' Ganymede?" (v. 585). "Yes by Zeus!," returns the Cyclops, using the customary verb for the rape of Ganymede: ... ὅν ἁρπάζω γ' ἐγω 'κ τῆς Δαρδάνου ("... the very one whom I abducted from Dardanos," v. 586). Both of these essentially comic passages imply that the boy, not unlike the average satyr, was more than a little willing to be "raped" and quickly adapted himself to the requirements of his new job. While they are reflected neither in the literature nor the art of his own time, Euripides' less dignified renditions of the Ganymede myth prefigure the comic, caricatured history of the rape in art and literature of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, which ultimately makes its way into the repertory of western art, particularly in the North (e.g., Rembrandt's "Rape of Ganymede" in Dresden).[201]

All told it seems clear that Euripides sought both to depart from and to embellish the traditional, delicately phrased formulae (i.e., youth, beauty, fairness) for referring to Ganymede and had a reason for doing so. Using language that is in the present context tragic for its very loveliness, in the Ganymede Ode, Euripides manages to dramatize with a single image the paradox of the gods' divergent, and seemingly arbitrary, treatment of mortals, offering up an idyllic, business-as-usual vignette involving a favored mortal in heaven, who happens also to be a Trojan, as a foil to the dreadful symptoms of the gods' willingness to wreak havoc upon those unfavored on earth, should they so choose. As if to emphasize the arbitrariness of divine prerogatives, the second antistrophe of the Ganymede Ode begins: Ἔρως Ἔρως (*Tr.* 841). Two Loves, Troy's fate. The destructive forces of two unbidden loves, better for all concerned to have been resisted, whether of a Ganymede or of a Helen, whether by a god or by a mortal, of a mortal or of a demi-god, have leveled a mighty city and its powerful, prosperous inhabitants. The idyll will go on on Olympus—that is the prerogative of divinity. Humans, however, have no choice; the ill-advised marriage of Paris and Helen is defunct, like Troy itself. The guilty bride will be returned to her legitimate master; the city will be consigned to memory and to epic poetry.

While it has no obvious precedent in literature, the phrase "beautifully serene face" at *Tr.* 837 is, as it turns out, a perfect description of the

[201] Philippe Bruneau, "Ganymède et l'Aigle: Images, Caricatures et Parodies Animales du Rapt," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 86 (1962), 193–228 (201–202); the Rembrandt is illustr., along with other examples of the type, in James M. Saslow, *Ganymede in the Renaissance. Homosexuality in Art and Society* (New Haven and London, 1986), fig. 5.9.

profiles of faces on early and high Classical red-figure Attic vases, not to mention in Classical art in general. It is an unmistakable look which has been epitomized for all time in the formula for faces that is ubiquitous among the figures on the Parthenon frieze, a look which is and always will be a symbol of serene, if somewhat cold, classical perfection, "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur," indeed (though Winckelmann of course never saw the Parthenon frieze). Perhaps the best-known depiction of Zeus abducting Ganymede, the early Classical terracotta group from Olympia, is noteworthy not only for the calm, serene expression on the face of the abductee but for its lingering traces of the Archaic smile, which may or may not be a signifier of the protagonists' frame of mind.[202] Indeed the word ἁρπαγή[203] scarcely suits the action we see portrayed. Of the figures' demeanor, Burnett, who also mentions the statuette in connection with the Ganymede Ode, writes: "The moment of capture is shown in all its auspicious joy in the terracotta from Olympia, as a smiling Zeus strides off towards heaven with an equally contented boy tucked under one strong arm. This was the rape of Ganymede as the fifth century still knew it, a mutually satisfactory meeting that gave festive proof of easy intercourse between men and gods."[204] While not all iconographers of Greek art would agree with this optimistic assessment, there can be no mistaking the pleasant expressions on the faces of the two figures; the grimaces of some of the scarcely later Lapiths and Centaurs from the west pediment of the Temple of Zeus, in the same museum, offer an instructive comparison.

It is possible that Euripides' familiarity with the visual arts of his time inspired him to choose the epithet καλλιγάλανα at *Tr.* 837, a composite which could just as aptly serve as a epithet for the prototypical classical expression, itself.[205] The courtship and abduction of Ganymede by Zeus

---

[202] Olympia Museum, no inv. no. (Boardman, *GSC*, fig. 33); see, recently, Alike Moustaka, *Grossplastik aus Ton in Olympia* (Berlin, 1993), pp. 42–45.

[203] According to Jan Bremmer, "An Enigmatic Indo-European Rite: Paederasty," *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 279–298 (285–286), the "terminus technicus" for the capture of Ganymede, while the place in the Troad where the event took place was called Harpagia; even the Creten version of the story which has Minos as the abductor retains the same place name: Harpagias.

[204] Burnett, "*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede Ode," p. 305.

[205] That γαλήν and associated forms are favorites of E. (e.g., the famous passage at *Or.* 279) need not hinder the present argument. Burnett, "*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede Ode," p. 305, also compares representations in art, drawing attention to the "magnificent good cheer" that characterized both artistic and literary renditions of Ganymede; she stops short, however, of directly connecting the epithet καλλιγάλανα to works of art.

becomes a popular subject with vase painters around the beginning of the fifth century and persists for well over half a century.[206] The variety of artistic interpretations of the myth on Attic vases can be seen by comparing three examples, in which each artist has chosen a different moment to dramatize: First, and perhaps the most famous representation of Ganymede in Classical art, the bell krater by the Berlin Painter of ca. 490/80 in the Louvre (G 175)[207] depicts the moment just before the abduction; the nude body of the boy is calligraphically spun off of a large circular hoop, an emblem of his soon-to-be-lost childhood, while he holds a cock in his left hand, an emblem of his about-to-be-entered erotic prime; here, the face of Ganymede affects an Early Classical pout rather than Classical serenity, as he directs a last glance at his toy and away from the bird which is proudly perched at the end of his rigid arm, as if sure that it will prevail in the end; the serene countenance would come later, after his sexual initiation with the deity. Second, a kantharos by the Brygos Painter, also of ca. 490/80, in Boston (MFA 95. 36),[208] which shows a fleeing Ganymede with mouth slightly open but otherwise unperturbed, the hoop in his left hand now an afterthought, as he gazes back towards his magnificent pursuer, evidently fascinated; the boy's clothing has fallen from his body, and he is just within reach of the desperate, grasping hands of the infatuated god. Third, the tondo of a cup by the Penthesileia Painter of ca. 460/50 in Ferrara (Mus. Naz. 9351),[209] which depicts the moment just after the capture, with the two decoratively overlapping figures gazing deeply (lasciviously?) into each others eyes, giving an impression of lust rather than serenity; the thrill of the "chase" just behind them, the two seem ready to proceed with the inevitable. Later in Greek art, and throughout Roman times, the abduction of Ganymede would be depicted with a swan or an eagle, and the delicate foreplay between the older god and the younger prince suggested by the intertwined gestures, glances and limbs will be forfeited.[210] A post-abduction Ganymede is portrayed on the job as cup bearer on the exterior of a late-sixth-century cup by Oltos in the Tarquinia National Museum (RC 6848), but without the serene

[206] Carpenter, *Art and Myth*, p. 40; cf. Woodford, *The Trojan War*, p. 39; *LIMC*, s. v. Ganymedes, §§ 7–53.
[207] Simon et al., *Die griechischen Vasen*, figs. 143–144.
[208] Woodford, *The Trojan War*, fig. 29.
[209] Woodford, *The Trojan War*, fig. 30.
[210] *LIMC*, s. v. Ganymedes, §§ 84–91 (swan; Greek vases, all), §§ 92–266 (eagle; other media, but not vases).

expression that would be one of the hallmarks of the Classical style.[211] Giving a better sense of what Euripides intended by καλλιγάλανα, the Trojan boy, with Classical profile and in the relaxed *contrapposto* pose, is pictured at a divine symposium serenely and unobtrusively by the side of Zeus on the exterior of a cup by the high Classical vase painter, the Codrus Painter, in the British Museum, London (BM E82).[212] This picture happens to evoke both the vignette at *IA* 1049–1053 and the beginning of the second strophe of the Ganymede Ode (*Tr.* 821–824).

Our brief overview of depictions of Ganymede on vases suggests that the broad range of facial expressions whose representation in monumental painting was so widely admired had not found its way into vase painting, where the limitations of the medium made such individualistic distinctions more difficult, thereby offering further evidence of the depth and breadth of the technical impasse that lay between free painting and painting on vases. When the aim was *absence* of expression, however, vase painting could easily have served as the source of inspiration for Euripides' καλλιγάλανα at *Tr.* 837. Perhaps the playwright had seen vases with pictures of Ganymede maintaining a calm, serene, typically Classical profile in the face of forcible rape, noting that the irony of his calm demeanor under these circumstances is echoed by his calm servitude to the gods as the Greek army sacked Troy in his play. Euripides was not one to overlook irony. The discordance between the Trojan boy's signature expression in art and the anguish felt by the Trojan women in real life would be obvious, as well, to those in the audience familiar with the abundant pictorial record of the Ganymede myth. I suspect that Euripides means both the Trojan women of the play and the real-life audience to visualize art works as they sing and listen to the Ganymede Ode.

Conclusion

Allusions to the vase painter's repertory of images and techniques, while more modest in intent and implication than the those that reflect developments in monumental painting, are nonetheless important evidence for Euripides' attention to all manner of two-dimensional art, from the

211 Simon et al., *Die griechischen Vasen*, figs. 92–94.

212 Robertson, *The Art of Vase-Painting*, fig. 227; for interpretation, see, recently, Amalia Avramidou, "Attic Vases in Etruria: Another View on the Divine Banquet Cup by the Codrus Painter," *American Journal of Archaeology* 110 (2006), 565–579.

restricted domain of the vase to the more expansive and seemingly limitless visual field of its higher-status and higher-profile sister art. These, along with the subtle allusions to the mechanics of rendering the illusion of three-dimensional forms on a flat surface, the more ideologically potent references to the various conundrums they posed, and the painterly attributes of the playwright's style, together suggest that the notion of represented space, with all of its dependency on a compromised reality and the ramifications it entailed, was embraced without judgment by Euripides, who uncovered the dramatic potential in those ramifications when they are made to serve as analogues for various aspects of the human condition and for real-life perception, in both senses of the term, of events and circumstances. The very things about the art of painting that troubled Plato, as evidenced by his frequent invectives against both painting and poetry that are codified in the *Republic* and have never ceased to challenge subsequent thinkers in the fields of philosophy, aesthetics, art history, and literary criticism alike, would not have bewildered Euripides, who was eyewitness to some of the most significant developments in the history of western painting, and was himself guilty of imposing momentous changes on an established genre.

In Euripides' day painting, rather than sculpture, was the locus for the experimentation of the avant-garde, a pattern that would repeat itself throughout the history of western art. Like Plato, who was both fascinated by and skeptical of the late Classical painter's repertory of expressive and illusionistic devices, Euripides, also, to judge from the above examination of passages that reflect upon the mimetics of the art of painting, kept himself abreast of them. Unlike the philosopher, however, he does not seem to have felt the same intimidation before the idea of progress in the art form, but rather appears to have taken in stride the reality that the history of art is driven by an unplanned, irregular sequence of technical and conceptual discoveries and refinements of previous discoveries, that each forward stride at once renders all previous history of art antiquated, changes its trajectory and, rather than diminish or constrict the nature of our relationship with the visible world, challenges it, offering an impetus to reassess the way we view that world and its occupants. One master of mimesis is not distrustful of another. This was obviously a sympathetic realm for Euripides to share with the visual artists, for like the ancient painters he was a modernist, innovator, and iconoclast whose efforts propelled an art form into unimagined new territories that still resonate today in the mimetic space of the theater.

CHAPTER FOUR

ION

Introduction

Euripides' *Ion* is so rich in references to works of art that it deserves an entire chapter to itself. However, since much of its imagery has to do with weaving, a subsidiary theme of the present chapter is "textiles," in keeping with the pattern of segregation by medium in the previous chapters, the pursuance of which will lead beyond *Ion* and well into the Euripidean corpus.[1] A tertiary theme is, naturally, the world of women. For the craft of weaving has been linked with women in literature and art, as in life, in a continuous tradition that begins with the earliest preserved illustrative examples of weaving women, Helen of the *Iliad* (3. 125–128; 6. 323–324; cf. *Od.* 4. 133–135) and Penelope of the *Odyssey* (passim).[2]

That weaving and its language infuse the imagery of Euripides on a regular basis is not unexpected: He is the sole ancient playwright whose attitude toward the female sex is remarkable enough to have been

[1] Nicole Loraux, *The Children of Athena. Athenian Ideas About Citizenship & the Division Between the Sexes* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 12 and 225, also makes a point of the centrality of "the act of weaving" in this play, as does Froma I. Zeitlin, "Mysteries of Identity and Designs of the Self in Euripides' *Ion*," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 35 (1989), 144–197 (174).

[2] In the palace culture of the late Bronze age, women "almost always" did the spinning and weaving, according to Janice L. Crowley, "Mycenaean Art and Architecture," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*, ed. Cynthia W. Shelmerdine (Cambridge, Eng., 2008), pp. 258–288 (277). However, it was not exclusively a domestic occupation. In an overview of the evidence provided by the Linear B tablets, John Chadwick, *The Mycenaean World* (Cambridge, Eng. 1976), pp. 151–152, identifies two categories of women laborers at Pylos, where the data are fullest: "domestic" and "industrial." The latter, Chadwick concludes, "is exclusively concerned with textiles." According to the author the tablets disclose that between five and six-hundred women were employed in Pylos and the provinces in the production of textiles; the various groups of workers are distinguished according to areas of expertise: wool-workers, linen-workers, spinners, carders, weavers, finishers, "makers of headbands," and carpet makers, among others. For literary evidence of male weaving, primarily commercial, see Wesley Thompson, "Weaving: A Man's Work," *The Classical World* 75 (1982), 217–222.

debated since antiquity.[3] While critics are unlikely ever to agree whether Euripides admired, pitied, or reviled women (or all of the above), there can be no argument that he reserved some of his most memorable roles for them. For Aeschylus, it is Clytemnestra, for Sophocles, Deianeira and Antigone; even given the discrepancies in number of preserved plays, the list for Euripides can be said to be much longer: Alcestis, Medea, Phaedra, Hecuba, Andromache, Helen, to name just the most prominent. Moreover, Euripides' Medea, as Taplin has observed, "is the only transgressive or destructive female that we know of in Greek tragedy who is not brought low."[4] This playwright's female characters in particular have spawned a vast progeny in western art, literature, and music, and no wonder. Perhaps no other male artist before Richard Strauss comes closer to penetrating the female psyche. Whether Euripides personally favored writing roles for powerful, flawed, women, or whether it is simply because they are inherently tragic that women dominate Greek tragedy in general—in disproportionate measure to their status in real life—is arguable. At any rate portraying women permitted Euripides many an occasion for employing words and images related to weaving.

To be sure, the tendency to employ the language of weaving in a multitude of metaphors and other figures is by no means an innovation of Euripides'. Weaving as metaphor for human speech is a linguistic habit that is common to numerous ancient and modern cultures and already has a history by the second half of the fifth century BC (e.g., Bacch. 5. 9–10; 19. 8) that would continue to evolve after Euripides and his peers were finished with it.[5] Because speech, as opposed to action, slides easily into the realm of the ephemeral and the misleading, the metaphorical use of the language of weaving is traditionally extended to deceitful behavior and trickery, with or without the accompaniment of speech, especially in the case of women, who were most closely involved with the craft and who (of course) were not to be trusted anyway. Nancy Rabinowitz considers weaving a symbol for what she aptly calls

---

[3] E.g., Ar. *Ra.* and *Th.*, passim. See, recently, Anton Powell, ed., *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality* (London and New York, 1990).

[4] Taplin, *Pots & Plays*, p. 119.

[5] John Scheid and Jesper Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus. Myths of Weaving and Fabric*, trans. Carol Volk (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1996), esp. 111–155; Gregory Nagy, *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*, (Hellenic Studies) 1 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2002), pp. 70–98.

"artful femininity."[6] Thus, Penelope, herself, while presented as a model for upstanding behavior, proudly indulges in the calculated lie of her nightly unweaving of Laertes' shroud (*Od.* 19. 141–163) in a literal enactment of weaving deceit. So too Sappho's early address to Ἀφρόδιτα ... δολ[όπλοκε ("wile-weaving ... Aphrodite," fr. 1. 1–2 [Voigt]) reflects an already entrenched cliché of womanly wiles, here associated with the most feminine of goddesses. Clearly Euripides draws upon a well-established tradition when he exploits the craft of weaving as a source for imagery and tropes. Nonetheless, as we shall see, he finds ways to treat familiar material in his own distinctive manner.

The focus on *Ion* allows yet another theme to emerge as the chapter progresses: Athens. As an Athenian Euripides had a singular claim to acquaintance with the female-dominated art and craft of weaving. The craft enjoyed a special prestige in the city named for and presided over by the patron goddess of weaving. Athens was the city of "the peplos." The ancient image of the goddess received a fresh rendition of the intricately woven Panathenaic peplos at her quadrennial festival, which culminated in a ceremonious exchange on the acropolis of the old robe for the new.[7] The old garments were carefully stored away as sanctified objects.[8] In the *Iliad* (5. 735) Athena made her highly ornamental (ποικίλον) peplos with her own hands and with great toil (κάμε). Elite Athenian women were entrusted with the task of weaving the Panathenaic robe with its complex figural narrative, the Gigantomachy, every bit as challenging a design problem as that posed by any temple pediment or frieze in antiquity, and on a far more intricate and more intimate scale, where mistakes would be difficult to conceal.[9] Since girlhood these young women will

---

[6] Rabinowitz, *Anxiety Veiled*, pp. 143–144; her discussion is centered on the role of weaving in E.'s *Med.*

[7] A good recent overview of the evidence for the Panathenaic peplos is E.J.W. Barber, "The Peplos of Athena," in Neils, *Worshipping Athena*, pp. 103–117.

[8] Evelyn B. Harrison, "The Web of History: A Conservative Reading of the Parthenon Frieze," in Neils, *Worshipping Athena*, pp. 198–214 (203); a fourth-century inscription (*IG* II^2 1462) mentions a πεπλοθήκη on the Athenian acropolis, which Blaise Nagy, "A Late Panathenaic Document," *The Ancient World* 3 (1981), pp. 107–111, has argued refers to the storage place for the old peploi.

[9] The definitive article by A.J.B. Wace, "Weaving or Embroidery?," *American Journal of Archaeology* 52 (1948), 51–55, clarifies that the technique used for such complex designs was the tapestry weave, not embroidery. Regarding the peplos, I will not engage such vexed questions as to whether there were one or two robes woven for Athena and presented to her during the Greater (every four years) and Lesser (every year) Panathenaic festivals, and whether men were involved in the actual weaving; see, recently, Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 45, and esp. Barber, "The Peplos of Athena," who

have practiced the art to perfection by weaving their own clothes with complex designs.[10] Mimetic replicas of these garments were on display in the vividly polychromed korai, the dominant statuary type on the Archaic acropolis until the Persian invasion. That the craft of weaving was closely associated with the featured goddess of the acropolis in part accounts for the elaborate and varied woven designs which are a primary feature of the votive statues that were offered to her for the better part of a century. Even with their last traces buried on the acropolis, the korai and all that they represented remained a prominent symbol of old Athens. As such, they will figure one final time in our narrative.

Ion *and the Acropolis*

With a plot about the origins of the Athenians, the iconography and monuments of Athens are naturally given pride of place in Euripides' *Ion*. Though the play is set at Delphi, Athens is never out of mind for an audience of locals who well know from the start who Ion is and what role he plays in their shared genealogy. The story of Apollo's rape of Creusa, one of Erechtheus' daughters, under the "long cliffs" on the north side of the acropolis and the subsequent birth of Ion is recounted in detail by Hermes at *Ion* 10–27, immediately upon mention of Delphi, the god's present location and the scene of the action to come. As Lee observes of this passage: "Hermes' narrative moves from Delphi straight to Athens so that the two places of chief interest in the play are juxtaposed and brought into focus at the outset."[11] The episode is rehearsed again in the exchange between Creusa and her old servant at vv. 936–949. So too in

opts for two peploi, the larger "sail-peplos" being woven by professional male weavers. Barber, op. cit., p. 117, believing in two peploi, and referring to the yearly peplos, observes that young girls, older girls, and even married women were involved in the making of the garment. The Roman paroemiographer Zenobius (*Proverbs* 1. 56 [Leutsch and Schneidewin]) claims that two Cypriot male weavers, Helicon and his father Acesas, were the first to "fabricate" (ἐδημιούργησαν) the Panathenaic peplos; while these two were famed for their weaving skills (Athenaeus 2. 48b, and below), the verb leaves unclear exactly what role the men played in the production of the peplos.

[10] Besides the weaving of garments and other household essentials, at least two additional weaving-related activities were pursued by young women, the plaiting of hair and the plaiting of garlands to wear around their heads and necks. As a result, the language of weaving and of plaiting is often conflated; cf. Scheid and Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus*, p. 118, with n. 26.

[11] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 161.

fr. 481. 9–11 (*Mel.S.*) the birth of Ion to Xuthus rather than Apollo is mentioned as having occurred on the acropolis of Athens, Κεκροπίας ἐπ' αὐχένι, a curious collocation. Cropp points out that the word for "neck" is sometimes used for "isthmus" or "strait" and is thus an appropriate way to characterize the elongated form of the acropolis.[12]

To keep Athens continually in the foreground of *Ion*, Euripides provides his audience with frequent reminders of familiar topographical landmarks from the acropolis, both historical and contemporary, many of which would be at their backs in real time during the play's performance.[13] Thus, the Παλλάδος ναῶν mentioned by the chorus at *Ion* 497–498 are either the early temples on the site, whose existences are well-documented archaeologically but whose precise number and location remain controversial, or the ancestors of the Periclean Parthenon. The dates and identities of the older buildings, along with many other aspects of the Pre-Periclean acropolis, remain controversial; at the very least, however, there are enough archaeological remains to document the existence of several distinct buildings.[14] There is little need to identify the Παλλάδος ναῶν of *Ion* specifically as the Parthenon and the

[12] Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 267.

[13] Cf. Henry R. Immerwahr, "Athenaikes eikones ston 'Iona' tou Euripide," *Hellenika* 25 (1972), 277–297, which treats iconographical themes rather than monuments, per se.

[14] The literature on these subjects is among the most extensive in all of classical studies; for a recent succinct description and general summary of the main arguments concerning the number and location of Archaic temples on the site, with further bibliography, see Robin Francis Rhodes, *Architecture and Meaning on the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge, Eng., 1995), p. 188, n. 1, who sensibly sums up: "The problem will always remain that more superstructures of buildings are preserved on the Acropolis than foundations with which they can be associated. We cannot be sure how many temples were constructed on the Acropolis before the Classical period or where they stood." Ridgway, "Images of Athena," pp. 124–127, also reviews the evidence in more detail, although she concludes, perhaps too radically, that the Erechtheum functioned solely as the temple of Athena Polias, that is, the house for the "ancient image." In an important series of articles, William A.P. Childs, "Herodotos, Archaic Chronology, and the Temple of Apollo at Delphi," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 108 (1993), 399–441 (405–406), and "The Date of the Old Temple of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, eds. W.D.E. Coulson et al., (Oxford, 1994), pp. 1–6, assigns the old temple of Athena and its pedimental sculptures, usually dated to the 520s, to after 510 BC, following an earlier suggestion of Klaus P. Stähler, "Zur Rekonstruktion und Datierung des Gigantomachiegiebels von der Akropolis," in *Antike und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift Hans Erich Stier zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. R. Stiehl and G.A. Lehmann (Münster, 1972), pp. 88–112. Stewart, "The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions," p. 383, n. 23, would now date the sculptures even lower, "ca. 500."

Erechtheum, as some have wanted to do.[15] There were plenty of older buildings about which Euripides is likely to have known that had the advantage of being archaic enough to suit the ancient setting of the play, including the Hekatompedon and the old temple of Athena Polias, to name just two of the more solidly attested archaic structures.

In a somewhat puzzling reference to the temple of Athena Polias at *Ion* 235–236, we learn that Creusa and Xuthus live either in the temple or under the same roof as the holy shrine, depending upon whether one reads Παλλάδος ἔνοικα, with the ms., as part of the subject of the sentence (Verrall), or Παλλάδι σύνοικα as predicate, with Badham (followed by Murray, Diggle, and Kovacs). Commentators have interpreted these lines somewhat differently. Paley prefers to retain the ms. reading, explaining: "As Ion himself was *nurtured* in and by the temple of Apollo, so the Chorus represent their masters as the servants of the goddess at Athens."[16] Owen prefers Badham's emendation, translating: "the palace that reared my mistress is under one roof with the temple of Pallas."[17] Similarly, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has no problem with the idea of Creusa and her father living in what he assumes is the Classical Erechtheum, "mit der Polias."[18] Lee also prefers Badham's emendation and assumes that Creusa lives in the Erechtheum; curiously, however, his explanation for rejecting the ms. reading seems to contradict this: "the Ms. reading would have Kr. sharing a dwelling with Pallas."[19] Such distinctions are admittedly fine. However, the difference may lie in whether the reference is to the old temple of Athena, which was no longer standing in Euripides' day, a building of standard plan in which the ancient image was housed before the Erechtheum was built, or the Erechtheum itself, which incorporated a number of cult areas into its unorthodox plan, including, not implausibly, the house of Creusa and Xuthus. Either is possible, the latter, preferable.

As for the Classical Erechtheum, a discrete allusion to the building may be detected at *Ion* 281–282, a reference to one of the great foundation myths of Classical Athens, namely, Poseidon's losing effort in his contest with Athena for patronage of the city, which consisted of thrusting a trident into the rock to produce a salt spring. The irregular plan of the

---

[15] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 105, who concludes that the resulting anachronism "would hardly trouble Eur." anyway; Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 213.

[16] Paley^2 2, p. 25.

[17] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 88.

[18] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 97.

[19] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 185; cf. his remarks ad loc. *Ion* 1434–1436.

preserved Erechtheum includes, within the confines of the north porch, a cleft in the rock purportedly opened by the trident of Poseidon (Paus. 1. 26. 5), perhaps the very one that engulfed Erechtheus to his death (cf. E. frs. 360. 47, 370. 39–40, 59–60 [*Erec.*]).[20] Frazer describes the small crypt under the north porch: "The floor of the crypt is composed of the native rock, in the surface of which there are certain conspicuous indentations. In the marble pavement of the north porch there seems to have been an opening about 1. 31 metre square, exactly over these indentations, so that they must have been visible to anyone standing in the porch and looking down the aperture."[21] Meanwhile, references to Athena's gift to Athens, the olive tree that miraculously sprouted on the barren rock, are found at *Ion* 1433–1436 and 1480.[22] The Parthenon's west pediment, it will be recalled, depicted the contest between the two deities at colossal scale and with great dynamism; quite possibly in these passages Euripides means for his audience to be put in mind of that conspicuous contemporary interpretation of the well-known myth. Neither is the east pediment of the Parthenon neglected: At *Ion* 452–457 the chorus of Athenian women, entreating their patron deity, recall the "motherless" birth of Athena from the head of her father Zeus, the subject of the pediment that surmounted the temple's front door.[23]

The little Ionic temple of Athena Nike, a late-fifth-century addition to the topography of the acropolis, is the likely recipient of a couple of oblique references in the play. At *Ion* 452–460 the chorus of Athenian women juxtapose Athena with Nike in a way that is suggestive of the cult at the southwest corner of the acropolis, where the two deities had

[20] A mark of his trident is the sign by which Poseidon is recognized at A. *Supp.* 218 (ὁρῶ τρίαιναν τήνδε, σημεῖον θεοῦ); although H. Friis Johansen and Edward W. Whittle, *Aeschylus. The Suppliants*, 2 (Denmark, 1980), p. 175, assume that it is the trident itself that is seen, the use of σημεῖον implies that it is the mark. Poseidon also left the mark of his trident where he produced a similar spring at Lerna, after rescuing his mistress Amymone from a satyr, mentioned at E. *Ph.* 187–189; see Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 204.

[21] Frazer, 2, p. 334; he concludes that these indentations are the marks of the trident at pp. 336–337. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 204, disagrees, suggesting instead that these "fissures were most likely considered scars left by the thunderbolt of Zeus, which put an dramatic end to the contest," and speculates that the trident marks and the salt sea itself might have been incorporated in an antechamber in the interior of the building whose floor was sunken (p. 203).

[22] Cf. fr. 360. 46 (*Erec.*); *HF* 1178; *Tr.* 801–802.

[23] In fr. 370. 64 (*Erec.*) the epithet "motherless" attached to the name of Athena might similarly have brought to mind the east pediment of the Parthenon; cf. Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 191.

been conflated from at least the mid-sixth century.[24] Creusa is more direct at v. 1529: Νίκην Ἀθάναν. Erection of the temple of Athena Nike in this location probably took place in the mid 420s, a few years after construction of the adjacent Propylaea, which encroached upon the shrine, ceased ca. 432 BC.[25] A fourth-century inscription records that the Athenians dedicated a statue of Athena Nike from spoils taken from battles that took place in 426/5, an event which has been associated with the temple.[26] Pausanias (5. 26. 6) saw two statues standing beside one another at Olympia, one of Athena by Nikodamos of Mainalos and one of Nike by Kalamis; he believes that the latter was an imitation of a *xoanon* (that is, an ancient wooden image) called "Wingless" at Athens; during his visit to the acropolis, he mentions seeing the temple of Wingless Victory "on the right of the propylaea" (1. 22. 4). The date of *Ion* is much debated; however, to judge from the only reliable evidence, the proportion of resolved feet (= substitutions of two short syllables for a long), which Euripides used with greater frequency as his career advanced, to the number of trimeters, it is almost certainly not one of Euripides' early plays. The evidence collected by Martin Cropp and Gordon Fick in their study of resolution rates in Euripides indicates a date in the range of 418–413 BC.[27] Owen prefers ca. 418 or 417, while, more recently, Lee suggests "a date near that of *Troades* (415 BC)."[28] Nike is conflated with Athena Polias in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (v. 134), a play which can be dated with a high degree of certainty to 409 BC; both Richard C. Jebb and T.B.L. Webster associate the passage with the temple of Athena Nike whose construction was completed roughly at the same time as both Sophocles' play and, they assume, Euripides' *Ion*.

---

[24] Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens*, pp. 127–128, summarizes the archaeological evidence for earlier cult activity on the site, consisting of a mid-sixth century poros altar, as well as an inscription with the name of Athena Nike, and an early-fifth century poros shrine; cf. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, pp. 105–106, with fig. 75, a rendering of the altar.

[25] Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, pp. 160–161 and 209–213, most recently reviews the evidence for a date in the mid 420s for the beginning of the temple's construction.

[26] *IG* II^2 403; Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens*, p. 128, who gives a date of 425/4 for the statue's dedication. On the history of the statue and the cult, see Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 27.

[27] Martin Cropp and Gordon Fick, *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides. The Fragmentary Tragedies* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement), 43 (London, 1985), p. 23, Table 3. 5.

[28] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. xxxvi–xli; Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 40. Concerning *Ion* 457, Lee, op. cit., p. 210, observes: "The date [of the Nike temple] is disputed, but it is likely to have been completed some years before the production of *Ion*."

Both commentators point to the *Ion* passages. Webster adds that "the Athena who always helps Odysseus in the *Odyssey* is identified both with Victory (Νίκη) and the Athenian city-goddess (Πολιάς)."[29] Athena is called νικωμένη also at *Heracl.* 352, it too an undated play, but likely earlier than *Ion*.[30]

A.S. Owen, however, disavows any association with the cult or the temple when he observes that Nike is winged (πταμένα, v. 460) in the *Ion* chorus but wingless on the acropolis.[31] This would seem a forgivable point of confusion, the important factor being that wings are mentioned at all. There are plenty of female figures, winged or wingless, extant from the acropolis, including depictions of Athena either winged herself or along with a winged or wingless Nike. In the west pediment of the Parthenon, Nike (wingless) probably served as Athena's charioteer. In a scene from the Gigantomachy, Athena appears with a winged Nike in the fragmentary fourth metope on the east side of the Parthenon.[32] The Athena Parthenos herself held a winged figure of Nike in her right hand (Paus. 1. 24. 7). The two also appear together multiple times in the state-of-the-art frieze that decorated the parapet of the temple of Athena Nike, generally dated ca. 416–413 BC, which would make it, if all of these dates are reasonably correct, an exact contemporary of Euripides' *Ion*.[33] To judge from the preserved remains, though the three Athenas are themselves not winged, they are surrounded by nearly fifty magnificent, winged Nikai; in short the parapet is chock full of wings. The theme is not limited to Athens; a winged Athena mounting a chariot appears also at Delphi, the setting of *Ion*, on the west frieze of the Siphnian treasury (ca. 525 BC), in a scene whose subject has not been precisely identified.[34]

---

[29] Richard C. Jebb, *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Pt. 4. *The Philoctetes* (Cambridge, Eng., 1890), pp. 30–31, and T.B.L. Webster, *Sophocles. The Philoctetes* (Cambridge, Eng., 1970), p. 78.

[30] The preferred date hovers around 430; see Wilkins, *Euripides Heraclidae*, pp. xxxiii–xxxv; Allan, *The Children of Heracles*, pp. 54–56.

[31] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 103.

[32] Frank Brommer, *Die Metopen des Parthenon*, 2 (Mainz, 1967), pls. 48–49.

[33] Rhys Carpenter, *The Sculpture of the Nike Temple Parapet* (Cambridge, MA, 1929). For the date, see Ira S. Mark, *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural Stages and Chronology*, (Hesperia Supplement), 26 (Princeton, 1993), pp. 90–91. For interpretation, see, most recently, Erika Simon, "An Interpretation of the Nike Temple Parapet," in *The Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome*, ed. Diana Buitron-Oliver, (Studies in the History of Art) 49, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts (Symposium Papers) 29 (Hanover and London, 1997), pp. 127–143.

[34] Boardman, *GSA*, fig. 212. 4. Pierre Demargne lists additional depictions of Athena and Nike together in *LIMC* 2, pt. 1, p. 1002.

Artistic models aside, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff is right to remind us that the conflation of Athena and Nike would have special meaning for contemporary Athenians who were currently at war.[35]

The Ekphrasis of the Parodos

So thoroughly is Euripides' *Ion* saturated with the *genius loci* of Athens that its monuments are indirectly evoked even when the principal attraction at Delphi, the temple of Apollo, is the ostensible subject. We turn now to one of the most frequently cited and exhaustively analyzed references to a work of visual art in Greek literature, the ekphrasis on the temple of Apollo that is sung by the chorus during their parodos (vv. 184–236), the earlier of two major ekphrases in the play. The dramatic logic of Creusa's postponed arrival *after* her attendants (v. 236), which goes unremarked by both herself and the attendants, has been questioned,[36] but is easily explained. Allowing the chorus the opportunity to describe at length the decoration of the famed temple (not to mention to engage in a brief exchange with the protagonist, Ion) is a clever and entertaining way to infuse with *enargeia* the distinctive topographical setting for both the recollection of past events and the events to come at the very outset of the action. Moreover, it prompts a comparison between the chorus' exuberance, typical of sightseers of any era, at arriving at Delphi and Creusa's tears upon entering the sanctuary, the result of unpleasant memories dislodged by the same visual spectacle (vv. 245–246). The chorus, however, are not to be permitted to enter the temple; they must be content to remain outside, where they may enjoy further the multiple attractions of the building's exterior (vv. 230–231). In this they join the ranks of other well-known sight-seers including Telemachos at the palace of Menelaus (*Od.* 4. 43–46, 75), Odysseus at the palace of Alkinoös (*Od.* 7. 82–133), and Aeneas at Carthage (*Aen.* 1. 421–493).[37]

Although the ekphrasis is admired as an exceptionally elaborate and detailed literary account of the sculptural program of one of the most

[35] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 107.

[36] E.g., Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 88–89.

[37] Cf. *Andr.* 1085–1087, another, brief report of sightseeing at Delphi. The scene in Epicharmus' lost *Theoroi* in which visitors to Delphi marvel at the votive offerings on display there (Ath. 8. 362b) is often compared to the *Ion* parodos. X. *Hier.* 1. 11–13 describes the joys of sightseeing in the ancient world.

prominent temples of antiquity, it nonetheless raises fundamental questions about what exactly is being described by the Athenian sightseers.[38] These include (1) whether it is in fact the temple of Apollo or some other structure at Delphi; (2) if it is the Apollo temple, is it meant to be the very building that was standing in Euripides' day, whose remains have been excavated at Delphi; (3) if it is this building, whether its pediments, metopes, frieze, or some combination thereof; and (4) if it is the pediments, one or both, if the latter, how can the chorus see both, and if the former, why is the imagery of the west pediment described when the chorus are positioned with a view of the east (as suggested by *Ion* 82–88).[39] To these may be appended (5) if and how the building was represented on stage. Regarding the last, I share the views of Hourmouziades, who considers the matter at length and concludes that "nothing of what was referred to in their description was seen by the audience. To those of them who had been to Delphi the parodos served as a stimulation of the memory; to the others it was a strong appeal to the imagination. Oddly enough, no other play indicates the absence of elaborate and individual scenery in a more convincing way than the *Ion*."[40] I would add that the ekphrasis alone is so effective in its task of stage-setting that visual reproductions of actual monuments would have been superfluous. While that is all I will have to say about the issue of staging, the remaining issues outlined above will need to be addressed in some detail.

The first question is relatively easy to dispatch. Miller puts it well, that "it would be strange, indeed, if the chorus, standing in front of the

---

[38] In my analysis of the ekphrasis, I have found the following particularly useful: Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 82–83; Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 53–58; Winnington-Ingram, "The Delphic Temple," pp. 483–487; Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye," pp. 148–149; and Lee, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 177–179; all review the literature and comment upon these questions. Lee's general assessment (op. cit., pp. 177–185), as well as his commentary on individual lines, are especially intelligent and judicious, and include overviews of the relevant bibliography. Zeitlin, op. cit., pp. 147–156, well represents the newer, more broadly based approach to the ekphrasis.

[39] Regarding the west vs. east gable controversy, which I shall not address further, José Dörig, "Lesefrüchte," in *Gestalt und Geschichte. Festschrift Karl Schefold*, eds. Martha Rohde-Liegle, Herbert A. Cahn, and H. Chr. Ackermann, (Bern, 1967), p. 109, with n. 32, offers an interesting resolution. Following up on an earlier theory (A. Plassart, "Eschyle et le fronton est du temple delphique des Alcméonides," in *Mélanges d'études anciennes offerts a Georges Radet*, eds. Fernand Chapouthier, William Seston, and Pierre Boyancé, [Bordeaux and Paris, 1940], pp. 239–299) that had associated the prologue of A.'s *Eum.* with the imagery of the *east* pediment at Delphi (the arrival of Apollo on Parnassus), which A. very likely knew firsthand, Dörig wonders whether E. might have deliberately depicted the *west* pediment in response.

[40] Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination*, pp. 53–57; quotation, p. 56.

temple that was the glory of Panhellenic Greece at earth's central shrine, should sing such strains in praise" of any other structure on the site.[41] The temple of Apollo is by far the likeliest subject of the ekphrasis; we shall proceed on that assumption. The second question, concerning which temple, on a long sacred site that featured at least six successive structures dedicated to the resident deity, whether historical or mythological, is more complicated. The most common assumption has been that the chorus describe the building that stood in Euripides' day. However, identification and demonstration have not proved as straightforward as they should, if that is the case. Three major primary sources for the appearance of the sculptural decoration of the temple of Apollo at Delphi are extant; scholars of all stripes have accordingly attempted to reconcile them with one another. These are (1) the *Ion* parodos, itself; (2) Pausanias' brief description at 10. 19. 4; and (3) the archaeological evidence uncovered by the French in the 1890s and early 1900s. Simply put, modern critics and commentators have been bothered by the fact that the descriptions of the chorus of Euripides' *Ion* do not precisely match and reflect the arrangement, as far as can be told, of the preserved sculptural remnants from the building which was standing in the late-fifth century, the so-called "Alcmaeonid" temple (see below). Of the many who have written on the ekphrasis, a representative sampling will give a sense of the ways in which the reconciliation of the available evidence has been addressed.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff dismisses altogether the enterprise of attempting to match the chorus' description with the archaeological record.[42] Owen, while carefully summarizing the problems, eventually deflects the question toward the issue of what was represented on the stage.[43] Winnington-Ingram discusses the sculptures only briefly, noting the lack of correspondence with the archaeological evidence and suggesting: "Euripides may have used his imagination: he certainly invites the audience to use theirs."[44] Müller addresses the archaeological inconsistencies posed by the description but ultimately is interested in the dramatic purposes behind the selection of the imagery of the ekphrasis,[45] as is the case with Zeitlin, who takes for granted that the Almaeonid temple

---

[41] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 58.
[42] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 23.
[43] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 82–86.
[44] Winnington-Ingram, "The Delphic Temple," p. 484, n. 5.
[45] Müller, "Beschreibung von Kunstwerken im Ion," pp. 25–28.

is the referent.[46] Barlow simply assumes that it is the sculptured metopes of the temple which are being described, and does not address the archaeological problems; her interests also are primary literary.[47] Lee summarizes the scholarly argumentation in greater depth, and rejects the idea of a one-to-one correspondence with the decoration of the Almaeonid temple, concentrating instead on the significance of the ekphrasis within a network of other descriptions of images that occur throughout the play.[48]

Frazer was in a different predicament, since he wrote before the substantial remains of pedimental figures from this Archaic temple were excavated and published. Observing a lack of concordance between Euripides' account of the temple's decoration in *Ion* and Pausanias' description of the pedimental sculpture that was in place during the second century AD, Frazer infers that the sculptures the chorus see "occupied, not the gables, but the metopes under the gables at the eastern and western ends of the temple," which Pausanias does not attempt to describe.[49] We now realize that such speculation is needless, however; Pausanias' description can be of no assistance because the building that he saw was not the one that Euripides and his audience knew.[50] That these pediments were not those of the so-called Almaeonid temple becomes clear when Pausanias attributes the sculptures to two Athenians, Praxias and Androsthenes, who cannot have lived and worked in the later sixth century.[51] Thus, at least one of the temples that stood on the site, the one whose sculptural decoration is described by Pausanias, may be eliminated as the target of the *Ion* ekphrasis. We must now review the evidence for each of these buildings in turn.

According to Pausanias (10. 5. 9–13), four structures preceded the temple on the site in his own day, information that is seconded by an important earlier source, Pindar, *Paean* 8 (Rutherford B2).[52] Ian Rutherford has convincingly argued that Pausanias' account in fact draws on Pi. *Pa.* 8 and that, in the absence of any other early source, the inevitable conclusion is that "Pindar had a large hand in creating

---

[46] Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye," pp. 147–152.

[47] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, pp. 22–23.

[48] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 177–179.

[49] Frazer, 5, p. 329; Pausanias mentions only ὅπλα δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιστυλίων χρυσᾶ taken by the Athenians at Marathon.

[50] As Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 177, is among the few to recognize.

[51] Marion Muller-Dufeu, *La Sculpture grecque. Sources littéraires et épigraphiques* (Paris, 2002), pp. 555–559; cf. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 57–58.

[52] Cf. Arist. fr. 3 (Rose) (Porph. in Stob. 3. 21. 26); Philostr. *VA* 6. 10–11; Strabo 9. 3. 9.

the myth."[53] The first two buildings, we are told, were constructed of ephemeral materials such as laurel branches, beeswax, and feathers, while the third was said to be made of bronze; no traces of these, needless to say, have been discovered. Rutherford, however, has identified several Egyptian and Near Eastern parallels for temples made of ephemera and metals.[54] The first to be made of stone (poros or limestone) was the fourth, of which remains from the site have been identified.[55] This version, according to Pausanias, was built by Trophonius and Agamedes and burned down in 548/47 BC, although there is no archaeological evidence for a conflagration.[56] It will be noted that Xuthus, on his way to Delphi, stops to consult the oracle of this same Trophonius in a cave at Lebadeia (*Ion* 300).[57] The poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 287–299 offers the following account of the chronology of construction for what appears to be the first stone temple, traditionally the fourth on the site, to the god at Delphi: First, Apollo himself "laid out" (διέθηκε) the "foundations" (θεμείλια), then the architects Trophonius and Agamedes put down the "stone threshold" (λάϊνον οὐδον) and finally, "ineffable races" (ἀθέσφατα φῦλ') of men built the rest of the temple, in stone. At *Od.* 8. 80 Agamemnon, having come to Delphi (Πυθοῖ), traverses a threshold of stone (λάϊνον οὐδόν) in order to consult Apollo's oracle;

---

53 Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans*, pp. 214–232, the most extensive commentary on the four mythological temples at Delphi of which I am aware.

54 Ibid.

55 Gruben in Berve and Gruben, *Greek Temples, Theatres and Shrines*, p. 329, lists the remains which have been assigned to this temple: "a fragment of a Doric capital, two column drums …, a few orthostats and stylobate slabs, which at first probably bore wooden columns." Erik J. Holmberg, *Delphi and Olympia* (Gothenburg, 1979), p. 13, adds to this list: two triglyphs, and terracotta fragments from the cornice. The archaic character of some of the remains, including the wide-spreading echinus of the capital, and the U-shaped cavities through which ropes were passes in order to facilitate the hoisting of the blocks into place, have suggested a date for this building around 700 BC. This accords well with Hdt. 1. 14, who tells us that two foreign kings, Midas (738–696/5 BC) and Gyges (ca. 680–645 BC) presented elaborate gifts of gold and silver to Apollo at Delphi. We are told further that Midas was the first barbarian king to do so. These were stored in the Corinthian treasury, according to Herodotus, all of which suggests that already by this time Delphi was a thriving, built-up center.

56 Childs, "Herodotos, Archaic Chronology, and the Temple of Apollo at Delphi," p. 434, with n. 162, reviews the literary evidence for the pre-Alcmaeonid temple and its demise, which includes what the author considers a "certainly spurious" claim that the Peisistratids burned the temple, although he does not propose a date. For further discussion of this temple and its literary sources, see Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans*, pp. 222–225.

57 Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 94–95; cf. Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 192. The oracle is described by Paus. 9. 39. 5–14.

the same epithet, "stone threshold," is the synecdoche used by Achilles to refer to the temple of Apollo at Delphi again at *Il.* 9. 404. These references to a building whose "threshold," at least, was made of stone support the likelihood that this is indeed the fourth temple mentioned by Pausanias and that such a building was at least plausible in Homer's time, if not actually extant.[58]

That this is the case is reinforced when we learn that, by Pausanias' day, at the latest, the stone temple which had stood on the site previous to the Alcmaeonid temple was relegated to only a memory (λίθου δὲ αὐτὸν ποιηθῆναι μνημονεύουσι, [10. 5. 13]), consigned to the world of the ancient epic tradition in which it was preserved. Regarding this temple, Gottfried Gruben suggests that "its 'stone threshold' may have been a base of orthostates with a superstructure of wood and sun-dried brick."[59] Thomas W. Allen and E.E. Sikes suspect that the two architects laid down the first stone courses on the "plan traced by Apollo" and that the other workmen finished the building.[60] I think it likely that the idea of a "stony threshold" reflects the fact that the building had stone foundations and possibly a stone crepidoma and stylobate, and that the rareness and expense implied by the use of stone would have rendered these circumstances worthy of mention.

The temple standing at the time of *Ion*'s production, commonly referred to as "Alcmaeonid" because the prominent Athenian family rebuilt and outfitted the poros building with a marble east façade at some point in the later sixth century (Hdt. 5. 62; Pi. *P.* 7. 10–12), was probably destroyed by an earthquake in 373.[61] Curiously, and problematically, Pausanias does not mention this temple, which would have been, if one follows his chronology (10. 5. 9–13), the fifth on the site. Perhaps he conflated it with the building that he actually saw ("the temple of our time"

58 Gruben in Berve and Gruben, *Greek Temples, Theatres and Shrines*, p. 329, remains noncommittal about following Pausanias and precisely associating the remains of the temple destroyed in 548 with the one that comes down by way of the Homeric tradition, observing that the remains "scarcely indicate a date before about 600."

59 Gruben in Berve and Gruben, *Greek Temples, Theatres and Shrines*, p. 329.

60 Thomas W. Allen and E.E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (London, 1904), p. 103.

61 The Archaic temple is usually dated to ca. 510 BC, in deference to the literary evidence; however, Childs, "Herodotos, Archaic Chronology, and the Temple of Apollo at Delphi," has recently argued that the stylistic evidence offered by the sculptures of its pediments, which he presents in the form of a meticulously detailed analysis with appropriate comparanda, overrides the literary evidence, including Herodotus, and suggests a date for the building sometime in the decade 530–520 BC. On the destruction of this temple, see Frazer, 5, pp. 331–332.

[ἐφ' ἡμῶν], 10. 5. 13), the sixth and last, which is essentially the structure whose remains are visible today, the product of a major fourth-century BC rebuilding as well as alterations by the Roman emperors Nero and Domitian in the first century AD. The excavations at the site in the 1890s immediately posed challenges for Pausanias' chronology, as Théophile Homolle's struggles with the conflicting evidence, literary and archaeological, make clear.[62] That the original ground plan with its unusually long proportions was adopted with only slight changes and much of the material of the columns and superstructure of the Alcmaeonid temple was reused in the fourth-century version[63] might have caused Pausanias to overlook the earlier building. At any rate the two Roman interventions probably did not result in major transformations of the fourth-century structure and the latter is essentially the one that Pausanias describes.[64] The preserved fragments of the pedimental sculptures from the fourth-century temple of Apollo, the one Pausanias saw, have been identified and recently published; they are of no further interest to us here.[65]

Which building, then, is the target of the *Ion* ekphrasis? Though the Almaeonid temple was itself approximately three-quarters of a century old and decorated with Archaic, rather than Classical, sculptures, I submit that it was too well-known to go unrecognized, setting up the liability of an anachronism too extreme to sustain the historical ambiance of a plot drawn from Athens' earliest mytho-history. Moreover, there were at were at least four even earlier, and more fabulous predecessors among which to select. The fourth, and first stone temple is particularly intriguing. Knowledge of it was indirect, sparse, and subject to poetical embellishment and the interpolations of generations of collective memory, the better to serve as the intended referent for the fifth-century audience of Euripides' *Ion*. The reference to one of its alleged architects at *Ion* 300 is also tantalizing. Most likely, however, in the interest of dramatic plausibility, the playwright sought nonspecificity. He accomplishes this by providing a credible picture of a typical Greek temple's decorative program

---

[62] Homolle, "Monuments figurés de Delphes," pp. 630–639.

[63] Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, p. 217. On the history of the fourth-century replacement temple, see Gruben in Berve and Gruben, *Greek Temples, Theatres and Shrines*, pp. 330–331; Frazer, 5, pp. 328–331. In addition to the sixth (i.e., fourth-century) temple, Frazer, op. cit., pp. 331–332, presents literary testimonia for two additional alterations by Nero and perhaps Domitian.

[64] Cf. Frazer, 5, pp. 339–340.

[65] Francis Croissant, *Les Frontons du Temple du IVe Siècle,* (Fouilles de Delphes) IV, 7, (Athens, 2003).

based loosely upon the kinds of things he himself had seen and his audience would know, and exercising poetic license in choosing iconographical subject matter that would best suit his immediate purposes, all the while assuring his audience that the description does not fit one particular building literally. In this I would be even more forgiving than José Dörig, whose "Euripides ist kein Fremdenführer" is quoted with admiration by those inclined to accept a certain amount of artistic prerogative, and who reminds us forcefully that "we have no right to scold the poet" for a lack of precision in his chorus' description of the temple's decoration.[66] (The intentional ambiguity of the description would be undone, I might add, by a painted backdrop that showed a recognizable rendering of the Alcmaeonid temple, lending additional support to Hourmouziades' conclusion, above.) In general, for the purposes of the drama, Ion's Delphi need not, and perhaps should not, be regarded as the same sanctuary that Euripides' audience knew firsthand.

We may now proceed directly to the ekphrasis without the burden of expectation of a perfect one-to-one correspondence between Pausanias' account, the archaeological remains, and Euripides' poetry. The chorus of Athenian women begin on a note of disingenuous surprise that, not only in Athens, but also here at Delphi, do they decorate temples and erect statues. The sentiment comes across as a mild boast in the form of a reminder that their native city is world-renowned for the quality of its architectural and sculptural production and even panhellenic Delphi must be considered inferior by comparison.[67] Notice is thereby given that Athens as well as Delphi is to be invoked in the coming description, and that the iconography of the images that the chorus selectively remark upon, a selection of the temple's repertory, is to be as relevant to Athens as to Delphi. Immediately after taking in the beauty of the temple with its lovely columns (εὐκίονες), the chorus recognize some aniconic, herm-like images of Apollo Agyieus (ἀγυιάτιδες θεραπεῖαι, vv. 186–187).[68] But their attention passes quickly to the twin pediments of the temple (διδύμων προσώπων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς, vv. 188–189). It is time to

---

[66] Dörig, "Lesefrüchte," p. 106. Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 178, corroborates my impression that scholarly opinion has shifted away from standing in judgment of the archaeological accuracy of the description of art works in *Ion* toward treating the iconography as intelligently selected and integral to the action of the play.

[67] Cf. Ar. *Nu.* 306.

[68] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 179; Owen, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 83–84; cf. *Ph.* 631, where this same deity is bid farewell by Polyneices. Müller, "Beschreibung von Kunstwerken im Ion," pp. 25–27, argues that the reference is to an altar.

take a closer look at what Lee calls "a bold and unusually developed metaphor,"[69] which will lead naturally to potential solutions to questions three and four, posed above.

It is clear that διδύμων προσώπων καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς ("a beautifully-shaded [literally 'eye-lidded'] light of twinned faces," vv. 188–189), with which the chorus begin their ekphrasis, is a periphrasis to direct our attention to the two *pediments* of the temple, rather than the entire facades, as often in translations. While the language has puzzled some commentators to the point of inspiring a range of alternate propositions, encompassing both architecture and sculpture,[70] in this case there is scant need to look beyond the obvious: The reference is to doubled pedimental "faces," or "eyes" (it is well here to recall the root, ὄψ) shaded and protected from the intense Greek light by their overhung raking cornices as if the latter were eyelids. It is fairly easy to see how pediments might be thought to resemble eyes in their shallow triangular shape if one considers the rendering of the eyes in many an Archaic statue, especially the very early kouroi. (True, the expression "twinned faces" might also have been chosen to harbor a pun on the twin progeny of Leto, who is mentioned as her son's mother just previously in the line.) As for φῶς, it is pure poetry: Shelley's "a light of laughing flowers" ("Adonais," v. 441) may be compared.

But let us probe a bit more deeply into the image. From a literal point of view, the image makes sense if one considers the fact that when light shines on white marble of translucent quality and fine grain an optical illusion may result that the stone is transmitting a light of its own, as if from within, transforming the inert substance into a facsimile of living, breathing, vapor-emitting matter. We saw in Chapter One how pervasive is the ancient habit of associating parts of buildings metaphorically with individuals who find themselves in certain roles or display comparable character traits; the reverse, that is, the personification of architectural elements, may be far less common, but, as we have seen, Euripides does employ it on occasion, and perhaps we are seeing another example here. Furthermore, personification of those parts of a building which, like pediments, regularly incorporated mimetic representations of moving, seeing beings, both mortal and divine, is not at all forced. This idea is reinforced when, at the beginning of the second strophe, βλέφαρον

---

[69] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 179.
[70] Reviewed by Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 84; and Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 180.

διώκω (vv. 205–206), in a kind of visual and verbal pun, echoes the καλλιβλέφαρον φῶς with which the ekphrasis began, attesting now a reciprocal relationship between viewer and viewed.

True, if the pediments are the focus of the chorus' admiration at the start of the ekphrasis, notwithstanding the lovely obliqueness of vv. 188–189, one misses at some point a more direct technical indicator for this feature such as αἰετός or ἀετός ("eagle"), ἀέτωμα or αἴτωμα, or for pedimental figures, logically, τὰ ἐναιέτια.[71] According to LSJ (s. v. ἀετός, iv), the term is applied to the pediment "from its resemblance to outspread wings," but the choice might also reflect an acknowledgment of pediments' placement high in the sky, that they provided a convenient nesting place for birds, and that they come in twos, like eagle's wings. An alternative possibility is raised by Rutherford that the term is "less likely to be derived from the resemblance that a triangular gable bears to an eagle's spreading wings than from the Near Eastern and Egyptian custom of decorating gables with winged solar discs."[72] (I am reminded of Keats' simile, "Like a sick eagle looking at the sky," characterizing one of the effects on the poet of his first encounter with the Elgin Marbles, which included sculptures from the Parthenon pediments, in his sonnet of 1817, "On Seeing the Elgin Marbles.") Compare the use of a periphrasis at Pindar *O.* 13. 21 (Snell and Maehler) (θεῶν ναοῖσιν οἰωνῶν βασιλέα δίδυμον), which seems certain to be an allusion to the twin pediments (οἰωνῶν βασιλέα = "eagles") of a temple rather than to the acroteria which are commonly assumed to be the referent.[73] In the technical architectural sense these terms are well-documented in inscriptions.[74] Very infrequent

---

[71] Robertson, *Greek and Roman Architecture*, s. v. "Pediment"; LSJ, s. vv. ἀετός iv, ἀέτωμα, ἐναιέτια.

[72] Ian Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 219 and 226, following M. Cetin Sahin, "Aetos: The Greek Pediment," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 44 (1981), 146.

[73] Acroteria: C.A.M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (Cambridge, Eng., 1879), p. 110; J.E. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1937), p. 135, n. 3; William H. Race, *Pindar*, 1 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1997), p. 191, n. 3. A scholiast explains the line as a reference to pediments (Drachmann, ad loc. 29a).

[74] They appear numerous times in the Parthenon building accounts, specifically, those dating from 438/7–434/3 (e.g., *IG* I^3 445–449), the final years of construction, which refer to work on the pedimental groups (τὰ ἐναιέτια) and to payments made to their sculptors ([ἀγαλ]ματοποιοῖ); for discussion, see Arthur M. Woodward, "Some New Fragments of Attic Building-Records," *Annual of the British School at Athens* 16 (1909–1910), 187–205; Shear, *Periklean Building Program*, p. 279. Additional epigraphical occurrences include *IG* I^3 474. 187, a building inscription of 409/8 BC from the Erechtheum; *IG* IV^2 (I) 102 A. 98, 99 112, a fourth-century building inscription from the temple of Asclepios at Epidauros;

appearances in literature include Aristophanes’ *Birds* 1110 (ἐρέψομεν πρὸς αἰετόν) and Euripides himself in fr. 752c (*Hyps.*): ἰδού, πρὸς αἰθέῤ ἐξαμίλλησαι κόρας/γραπτούς <τ’ ἐν αἰετ>οῖσι πρόσβλεψον τύπους (“Look! Shift your eyes toward the sky and fix your gaze upon the painted sculptures in the pediments”), a fragment which has sometimes been connected with the *Ion* ekphasis. Though it may initially appear to divert us from our present purposes, it is worth digressing briefly on this fragment, an invaluable document of ancient viewing habits, which are in the final analysis the primary theme of the *Ion* parodos.

While the context of fr. 752c is not entirely certain, the Archaic temple of Zeus at Nemea is the likely referent,[75] and the verb (ἐξαμίλλησαι) implies that some effort was required to crane one’s neck upwards and peer directly into the sun in order to appreciate the spectacle of its pedimental sculptures. The helpful presence of αἰετ>οῖσι certifies that we are in the right locale. Even out of context, the fragment succeeds in conveying a rare and vivid impression of a common aspect of ancient viewing: the self-conscious, intentional decision to look skyward to apprehend the imagery and the iconography of architectural sculptures and perhaps be inspired or instructed by them (we have already discussed the instructional value of art as Euripides sees it). Plato parodies the body posture and the act of looking itself at *Republic* 529b (ἐν ὀροφῇ ποικίλματα θεώμενος ἀνακύπτων, “throwing one’s head back to gawk at the decorations on the ceiling”); though the target of the imagined gaze is ornamented ceilings rather than sculptured pediments, the point is the same. Compare also Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1215 (ὀροφὴν θέασαι), for another recre-

---

IG II^2 1668. 39, a fourth-century building inscription from Eleusis. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans*, p. 219, n. 21, observes that the “locus classicus” for this use of the term is Galen’s commentary on Hippocrates’ *De articulis* 3. 23 (C.G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, 18, 1 [Leipzig, 1829], pp. 518–519, ad ἀέτωμα οἴκου), whence, E. fr. 752c and Pi. *Pae.* 8. 70–71 (Snell and Maehler). Cf. Primavesi, “Colorful Sculptures,” p. 195, who, however, in his assertion that “it was a technical term by the late 6th cent. BC,” must have meant “late 5th,” since the inscription he cites as evidence (*IG* I^3 474) is from the Erechtheum.

[75] The most recent commentary and analysis of fr. 752c (*Hyps.*) is Primavesi, “Colorful Sculptures,” pp. 195–196, which includes a thorough and up-to-date bibliography and critical apparatus; the author describes the context of the fragment on p. 195. Kannicht (*TrGF*), J. Diggle, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford, 1998), p. 136, and Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, p. 186, with commentary, pp. 227–228 (cf. Collard and Cropp, *Euripides Fragments*, 8), assign the fragment (some tentatively) to Thoas in the beginning of the play. For the association with the temple of Zeus at Nemea, see Primavesi, loc. cit.; Cropp, op. cit., p. 228, with further references; Zeitlin, “The Artful Eye,” p. 296, n. 24, who discusses the passage, suspects that the two characters are looking at “the palace façade at Nemea.”

ational ceiling-gazer. In a recent monograph on temple decoration in the Archaic period, Clemente Marconi describes the contemporary awe induced by sculptured temples that are seconded by later literary sources such as Euripides' fr. 752c and the *Ion* parodos. Obviously, the rewards of viewing architectural sculpture justified the physical discomforts that viewing entailed. Marconi's observations about the Greek experience of *theoria*, which, "meant both going to a sanctuary and beholding," persuasively ally the two peculiarly ancient experiences of participating in ritual and observing the spectacle of architectural sculpture.[76]

That such craning-of the-neck looking involved a degree of discomfort and was regarded as an active, deliberative rather than a passive, incidental act may be inferred as well in the verb choice at *Ion* 205–206 (πάντᾳ τοι βλέφαρον διώκω [lit., "I pursue my eye(lid) in every direction"]), which just precedes the description of the Gigantomachy and suggests that the two Euripidean scenes should be regarded as parallel. The terms used in fr. 752c for the sculptures themselves, γραπτούς and τύπους, imply that these particular figures were in relief, most likely painted relief, in the old-fashioned Archaic manner of those in the pediments of the temple of Artemis at Corfu, in several of the early poros pediments from the Athenian acropolis, and in the east pediment of the Siphnian treasury, already mentioned, in which the figures are half high-relief and half in-the-round.[77] As well, the Gigantomachy of the west pediment of the Archaic Almaeonid temple at Delphi comes in the form of a flattened, frieze-like style which could at most be described as three-dimensional but certainly not volumetric by comparison with the standard set by the Parthenon's pedimental figures, for example.[78] The same deduction—that the figures are carved in some form of relief—might be made from the language used of the Gigantomachy at *Ion* 206 (ἐν τείχεσσι λαΐνοισι). We shall return to this issue shortly. On the other hand, an entirely two-dimensional painted scene as the inspiration for fr. 752c (*Hyps.*) seems less likely, owing to the presence of τύπους, a term strongly suggestive of three-dimensional art forms. However, it is not out of the

---

[76] Clemente Marconi, *Temple Decoration and Cultural Identity in the Archaic Greek World. The Metopes of Selinus* (Cambridge, Eng., 2007), pp. 216 and 28.

[77] Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, figs. 62–63, 66–69, 187. Georges Roux, "Le sens de ΤΥΠΟΣ," *Revue des Études anciennes* 63 (1961), 5–14 (9), reaches the same conclusion. *Pace* Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," pp. 195–196, who makes the case that τύπος may also indicate sculpture in the round and does so here; we shall revisit the term and the fragment in Chapter Five.

[78] The Apollo temple pediments: Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, figs. 199–203.

question: Cropp[79] draws our attention to an interesting new development in a report by Stephen G. Miller, the director of the excavations at Nemea, on recent analysis of material from the original temple of Zeus that had preceded by 250 years the fourth-century BC building whose remains currently occupy the site. According to Miller, there is no evidence for either free-standing or relief sculpture in the pediments of this early temple; however, "the discovery of many fragments of stone with a layer of plaster on which were painted designs suggests that the pediment was decorated with a painted scene," in apparent accord, as Miller himself observes, with Euripides' fr. 752c.[80]

Most likely, however, the terms used of the pedimental sculptures in fr. 752c, γραπτούς and τύπους, suggest that the figures were in relief rather than in the round, a technique which was characteristic of the very earliest temple pediments, and thus archaic enough to be considered plausible in the mytho-historical context of most Greek plays. If the pedimental sculptures in the ekphrasis of the *Ion* parodos, to which we now return, are also to be imagined as carved in high relief, rather than in the round, then the helpful shading of direct sunlight by the cornices would also be effective in further setting off the volumetric qualities of the carvings and their crisp, linear contours, in other words, in bringing out their best, lending further significance to the expression "beautifully-shaded." Finally, one more possible frame of reference, though humble, should not be overlooked. The image of the *Ion* chorus peering into the sky as the sun glanced off the white marble of the high-placed pediments of the Apollo temple might have put listeners instinctively in mind of the proper function of their own eyelids on these occasions: squinting and blinking.

Their eyes having found the pediments (though the chorus could obviously not see them both at once, one sculptured pediment implies a second), the group then splits in two, trading observations with a hint of self-satisfaction as the identifications of the depicted myths become clear—an impressive display of feminine expertise gained, as they acknowledge, from years at the loom (vv. 196–197). (The level of sophistication that such pictorial skills might reach is remarked by Euripides in a passage already discussed, the exchange between Orestes and his sister Iphigenia at *IT* 811–817, where we learn that Iphigenia in her youth had woven an episode from the saga of her ancestors, the strife between Atreus and

[79] Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, p. 228.
[80] *Archaeological Reports* 47 (2001), 24.

Thyestes, which included an image of the sun's changing course.) The description of the imagery itself, the ekphrasis proper, begins at v. 190. I have argued that, not only is it unreasonable to expect the description to match precisely the sculptural decoration of the temple that stood at Delphi in Euripides' day, but that Euripides aimed at no such thing. A welcome by-product of avoiding anachronism is that the playwright is free to introduce themes for the temple sculptures that will put the audience in mind of topographical monuments of Athens even as the chorus ostensibly describe those at Delphi.

Verses 191–204 of the first strophic pair describe two scenes, Heracles slaying the Lernaean hydra and Bellerophon riding Pegasus and slaying the Chimaira. That they are mentioned immediately after the chorus have had their gaze directed to the pediments strongly suggests that the two scenes are to be located in the pediment/s. However, an alternative preferred by many would be to position the two more fleetingly characterized motifs (the Heraclean labor and the Bellerophon battle) in exterior metopes, with the more extensively described scene to follow, the Gigantomachy, assigned to the pediment.[81] This arrangement would also make sense, since all of these typically sculptured areas could be taken in by the same skyward-directed glance. Not without reason the two scenes are often taken to refer to the imagery of two separate *metopes*, since in Greek art battling pairs make convenient compositional subject matter for the square field. The labors of Heracles seem to have been regarded as particularly well-suited to the design of the metope, as their popularity in that format demonstrates; extant examples that would have been familiar to most in Euripides' audience are found on the temple of Zeus at Olympia, the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, and the nearby Hephaisteion overlooking the agora in Athens itself. However, the Lernaean hydra and other snaky opponents of Heracles were also featured in several pedimental groups on the Archaic Athenian acropolis. Snakes figure as prominently in the mytho-history of early Athens, as is made clear throughout Euripides' *Ion*, as at Delphi, where Apollo slew the Python.[82]

[81] Cf. Théophile Homolle, "Monuments figurés de Delphes: les frontons du temple d'Apollon (1)," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 36 (1902), 587–639 (590–592); Dörig, "Lesefrüchte," p. 106; Gerhard Müller, "Beschreibung von Kunstwerken im Ion des Euripides," *Hermes* 103 (1975), 25–44 (28); W.J.W. Koster, "Le temple d'Apollon à Delphes et l'Ion d'Euripide," in *Festoen Opgedragen aan A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta bij haar Zeventigste Verjaardag* (Scripta Archaeologica Groningana) 6, eds. J.S. Boersma et al. (Groningen, 1976), pp. 373–382 (378–379); Vincent J. Rosivach, "Earthborns and Olympians: The Parodos of the *Ion*," *Classical Quarterly* 27 (1977), 284–294 (284).

[82] On snakes and snaky imagery in *Ion*, see Rosivach, "Earthborns and Olympians," pp. 287–288.

Regarding the second scene, the Bellerophon adventure, it may be significant that the Chimaira is not mentioned by name but rather alluded to by means of an epithet (τρισώματον ἀλκάν, "three-bodied power," v. 204) that refers to its composite nature as part lioness, part goat, and part snake. The epithet, however, happens also to be reminiscent of the distinctive triple-bodied monster of the "Bluebeards" pediment from the Archaic acropolis, which, although missing from the Athenian skyline for several decades, might conceivably have lived on in memory among the most elderly members of Euripides' original audience. The relative anonymity of this description—in contrast to that of the labor of Heracles just previous, it does not include any proper names—allows for and perhaps encourages free-association of such visual memories. Also worthy of note in this context is a bronze group, possibly gilded, composed of Bellerophon, Pegasos, and the Chimaira that evidently served as a central acroterion on the temple of Athena Nike (420s BC) and has been associated with the *Ion* ekphrasis.[83] This is not out of the question: A more conspicuous location than atop a temple on the southwestern bastion at the entrance to the acropolis is hard to imagine.

That said, while the imagery is suitable for, and some of it is actually documented in, both sculptured areas of the Greek temple, on balance it seems more likely that the first two scenes described by the *Ion* chorus are to be regarded as residing in the pediments, not the metopes, of the Apollo temple. The sequential descriptions of the two pediments would be perfectly comprehensible if, as is generally assumed, the chorus has divided itself into two groups, and would even offer a justification for the division. It is clear that two different parties share the first strophic pair (vv. 184–204), which contains the descriptions of the first two iconographical scenes. According to Lee the ms. divides the first strophic pair between the chorus and Ion, but Diggle, following earlier editors, instead divides the chorus into two groups and assigns to them the strophic pair; Lee himself concurs, dividing the chorus into two, leaving Ion out until v. 219, and even emphasizing their separation in his commentary on v. 190: "One group inspects more carefully and tells the other to do the same."[84] This makes perfect sense: The chorus will have divided up so

---

[83] According to a building account from the acropolis (*IG* I^3 482) that has been associated with the Nike temple by Patricia N. Boulter, "The Akroteria of the Nike Temple," *Hesperia* 38 (1969), 133–140, who also suspects that the group may be relevant to the imagery of the *Ion* chorus (p. 135, n. 17).

[84] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, pp. 179–180.

that together they can provide a descriptive panorama consistent with a concise verbal presentation of the sculptural decoration of a temple, by no means a simple or straightforward task. Thus, it is entirely possible that we are getting a description of two pediments at opposite ends of the temple rather than two adjoining metopes. The first is referred to with τᾶδ' (v. 190, Diggle following Dobree); the second with τόνδ' (v. 201); otherwise, no additional indications of placement or relationship to one another are given, perhaps because they are both being seen and described fairly simultaneously.

A change of venue is signaled at the start of the second strophe (vv. 206–207) by the phrase τείχεσσι λαΐνοισι. In particular τείχεσσι here has given editors and commentators some trouble.[85] Regarding the sense, Lee proposes: "But from the Chorus' view-point it is natural that the decoration of the pediment be seen as above or on the temple's walls."[86] Such discomfiture seems unnecessary. If it is meant to refer to a pediment, the term "tympanum," meaning the wall of the pediment against which the sculpted figures are disposed, would be a perfectly accurate way to understand "walls" here. The "stony walls" on which the chorus spot the Gigantomachy could therefore in theory indicate one of two architectural features, the tympanum of a pediment *or* cella walls which are capped with a running Ionic frieze. If the former, we might think of figures fully or partially engaged (ἐν, v. 206) with the wall of the tympanum, as in the east pediment of the Siphnian treasury, also on the site.[87] On the other hand, while the latter would be the rarer occurrence, Euripides and his audience were acquainted with a major example of such a frieze around the exterior cella of the Parthenon. There is, moreover, another conspicuous example at Delphi, itself, again on the Siphnian treasury. Consequently, a frieze is not out of the question. The subject matter itself (Gigantomachy) is appropriate for either a frieze or a pediment; prominent examples of both are to be found, including the north frieze of the Siphnian treasury, part of the frieze of the temple of Poseidon at Sounion, the west pediment of the so-called "Peisistratid temple of Athena," now in the Acropolis Museum in Athens, and one of the pediments of the temple of Athena Nike on the acropolis.

---

[85] Diggle follows Murray's spelling of the τείχεσι of the ms.; Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4, obelizes. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 96, believes, unnecessarily, I think, that τείχεσι at *Ion* 206 is corrupted from τύποις, which he translates "relief."

[86] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 181.

[87] Boardman, *GSA*, fig. 211.

Of the second strophic pair only the first half, the strophe (vv. 205–218), continues and completes the ekphrasis on the temple's decoration in a rather more lengthy description of a Gigantomachy. It is generally agreed that, while the ms. again divides the verses between Ion and the chorus, it is more likely that Ion enters only at the beginning of the antistrophe, when it is clear that he interrupts the sightseeing idyll and engages the chorus in a discussion of Delphi and the oracle.[88] The expedience of having the chorus describe the pediments in the earlier strophic pair in which *both* halves are devoted to the ekphrasis is, I think, obvious, and lends additional support to my suggestion that the first pair refers to the imagery of the pediments, rather than the metopes. On the other hand the interrupted, second strophic pair permits the description of a single unit of architectural sculpture only, which suggests that we look for a comparable feature on which to locate it on the building. Yet the Gigantomachy of the second strophe is automatically assumed to refer to a pedimental scene simply because that subject was actually depicted in one of the pediments of the Alcmaeonid temple at Delphi, and many critics have wanted to force the description to match the reality of Euripides' day.[89] However, the Gigantomachy as a subject is so common in Greek architectural sculpture that it no doubt loses much of its iconographical force and specificity over time. This makes it is an obvious choice, as also the labors of Heracles, for a mostly imaginary recreation of the decoration of a generic temple, as I argue is Euripides' intention with the ekphrasis. On that basis there is no compelling reason to expect it to match the Alcmaeonid temple with archaeological accuracy, though the occasional coincidence of subject matter, such as the Gigantomachy, might be noted by the audience.

In the final analysis I am inclined to conclude that in the second strophe the chorus is describing the imagery of an Ionic frieze. The activity characterized by the expression βλέφαρον διώκω (lit., "chasing," or "pursuing" one's glance) at *Ion* 205–206, with its implication that looking required effort, might just as correctly be applied to the viewing of a high-placed frieze as of a pediment. The phrase τείχεσσι λαΐνοισι of vv. 206–207 readily evokes exterior cella walls ornamented with an Ionic frieze at the top, an architectural rarity, to be sure, but certainly less

[88] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 181, with references.

[89] Childs, "The Date of the Old Temple of Athena," p. 3, while acknowledging the uncertainty of any attribution of location for the Gigantomachy, favors the west, which would be the end visible to those entering through the Propylaia.

so in the Athens of the later fifth century when the uncanonical idea of using an Ionic frieze on a Doric building, the Parthenon, not to mention its unorthodox theme, the Panathenaic procession, would have no doubt inspired curiosity and interest and perhaps even provoked public debate. There remains one final option: a Doric frieze, with alternating triglyphs and metopes, positioned at the top of an exterior wall in a non-peripteral building, such as the Athenian treasury, another conspicuous landmark at Delphi. In that case the Gigantomachy that the chorus see takes the form of a series of metopes. Just such a series happen to decorate the east metopes of the Parthenon, although not atop a wall. As applied to a Doric frieze βλέφαρον διώκω could betoken the idea of the eye darting from one metope to another in the process of assessing the entirety of the scene and its subject as it plays out in alternate square niches across the front of the temple. Though not out of the realm of possibility, the last option is less likely; even a generic version of the temple of Apollo at Delphi is better imagined as peripteral. To sum up: Heracles slaying the Lernaean hydra and Bellerophon slaying the Chimaira appear in the twin pediments of the temple; the chorus split up to describe them. The Gigantomachy takes the form of an Ionic frieze, which the chorus describe together; since it is a continuous, they can view it from any position.

The relevance of the iconography of the ekphrasis to the story that Euripides has subsequently to tell in *Ion* has been capably treated elsewhere and, moreover, does not fall within the scope of the present study.[90] For our purposes it is enough to reiterate that, because of the prominence accorded to the role of Athena in the most important battle in which the warrior goddess took part, the Gigantomachy as a subject is *de facto* to be associated with Athens, most especially of the Periclean period: The Panathenaic peplos, the interior of the shield of the Parthenos, and the east metopes of the Parthenon, all featured it as a decorative motif. In this tale of two cities, Athens is the default subject. This is made clear from the very beginning of the ekphrasis, when the first sight of the Apollo temple kindles a memory of Athens—as if the women anticipate the sad reawakening of Creusa's memory when she first sees the building—to

[90] The literature on the topic is plentiful; see, esp., Donald J. Mastronarde, "Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8 (1975), 163–176; Rosivach, "Earthborns and Olympians"; and Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye," pp, 147–156, whose interpretation is distinctive in that it incorporates the logistics of viewing, which is also the focus of Stansbury-O'Donnell, *Pictorial Narrative*, pp. 63–65.

their fervent embrace of the image of Pallas in the Gigantomachy as "our god" (ἐμὰν θεόν, v. 211) toward its end. In that revealing moment, during their ecstatic review of the depiction of the battle on the temple, the chorus immediately spy out "their goddess"; only secondarily do they spot Zeus, and finally Dionysos, the deity in whose honor they perform, in real time. Thus, even as they respond with evident excitement and pleasure to a famous monument in a foreign city, their home city of Athens is constantly on the chorus' minds throughout the ekphrasis.[91]

The escalating Athlenocentricism early in the play culminates in Creusa's "retracing of an old memory" (μνήμην παλαιὰν ἀνεμετρησάμην) at vv. 249–251, as she lays eyes upon the temple of Apollo, a building which we are to presume she has never seen before. This is a memory in which images of the two cities past, present, and future coalesce: Delphi, the home of Apollo and the site of her child's exposure, and Athens, her native city, the site of her rape by Apollo, and the fated destination of her son. In the end the context of the ekphrasis permits and even encourages the audience to think of Athenian monuments all the while that an ostensibly Delphic, if mostly imaginary, monument is being described. This built-in contingency for the original audience of *Ion* has also allowed us to weigh the possibilities of Athenian, more so than Delphic, sources of inspiration for the ekphrasis' imagery. It is well to remember that the temple of Apollo standing at Delphi when the play was produced itself had strong Athenian associations, the marble east facade having been paid for by one of the most influential Athenian families of the day, of which Pericles counted himself a member.

The Tent

Both the iconography of Athens and the craft of weaving are in evidence in the second major ekphrasis in *Ion*. At vv. 1128–1165 a servant relates how Ion was instructed by his father Xuthus to supervise the erection of a tent at Delphi in preparation for a feast celebrating the reunion of father and son. Before we discuss the ekphrasis, per se, which consists of the description of the imagery on the textiles that are to form the sides and roof of the structure, let us examine the technical language

[91] Cf. Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 182; Zeitlin, "The Artful Eye," pp. 149–150.

that Euripides deploys in the instructions given for fashioning the skeletal framework of the tent, which is also of interest in the present context.

From an architectural standpoint the structure is remarkably elaborate, regardless that it is meant to stand only for a short period of time. First, it is to be "joined all around" (ἀμφήρεις, v. 1128).[92] The adjective ἀμφήρης is a very rare word, occurring three times in Euripides and only otherwise in less than a handful of late lexica and scholia.[93] I follow LSJ (s. v.) that the meaning of this compound adjective is to be inferred from its derivation from ἀραρίσκω, thus incorporating the notion of "joining" and acknowledging a technical connection with woodworking in the translation. In this I respectfully part ways with most commentators, who have for some reason been reluctant to preserve this aspect of the term. Owen, for instance, outright dismisses a connection with the basic meaning of ἀραρίσκω, and thereby with the idea of craftsmanship, observing instead that "the servant affects such compounds."[94] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff observes: "ηρης wird in Zusammensetzungen sehr oft nur als Ablietungssilbe empfunden;" while Paley, tentatively suggesting that there need be no connection with ἀραρίσκω, offers: "something double-sided" and, therefore, "spacious."[95]

An argument can be made, however, that the Euripidean comparanda themselves justify preserving the craft basis of the root in interpretation of the *Ion* passage. In one example, at *Cy.* 15, a boat is "fitted on both sides" (ἀμφῆρες δόρυ). Paley again favors an emphasis on the force of ἀμφί, translating "two-sided ship" (as if there could be a one-sided ship), while LSJ, s. v., following Hesychius' definition of ἀμφήρεις (A 3921–3949 Latte), suggests "sculling boat."[96] Why is there a problem with simply "fitted tightly," as anyone who has built a boat or even a plank-on-frame ship model can attest is the case? In the other example, at *HF* 243, Lycus threatens to order that the altar of Zeus be made into a pyre with ἀμφήρη ξύλα. While nothing is actually constructed or joined in this case, the idea seems to be that the wood is very neatly and tightly stacked, as if joined, all around (πέριξ) the altar.[97] It will make a huge

---

92 Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 141, pointing out that the sense of ἀμφί is not "auf beiden Seiten" but "rings."

93 LSJ, s. v; cf. *TLG*.

94 Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 144, comparing vv. 1153, 1154, 1156.

95 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 141; Paley^2 2, p. 83.

96 Paley^2 3, p. 562.

97 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 64, construes the word adverbially with νήσαντες (and notionally with πέριξ) instead of with ξύλα; once again, he

bonfire, forcing the suppliants who have sought asylum there, Heracles' father, wife, and three sons, out from their position of safety or else burning them alive. The wood is to be harvested from two different mountains, Helicon and Parnassus; the same degree of deliberation is to be taken with its construction, as if it were a building—all of which seems calculated to give the suppliants plenty of opportunity to make up their minds to abandon their seat of refuge and to denounce Heracles and acknowledge Lycus as their lord.[98] Just previous to his threat, at v. 238, Lycus had punned on the notion of "piling something up," describing, in a demeaning sense, Amphitryon's long speech with the architectural metaphor πεπύργωσαι, one of Euripides' favorites, as we have already learned.[99] Subtle clues such as these lend further support to a properly technical interpretation of ἀμφήρης at *HF* 243.

Like the cornices of Agamemon's palace at *Or.* 1570, Ion's tent at Delphi is to represent the fruits of craftsmen's labors (τεκτόνων μοχθήμασιν, v. 1129). More of a pavilion, the space enclosed is ten-thousand square feet (vv. 1138–1139), able to accommodate "the entire populace of Delphi" (v. 1140). The angles are to be perfectly squared (πλέθρου σταθμήσας μῆκος εἰς εὐγωνίαν, v. 1137). Furthermore, the dimensions are to be laid out precisely and almost ritualistically, in the manner dictated by "experts" (i.e., craftsmen) in matters of measuring (ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ σοφοί, v. 1139). The language of these lines has provoked its share of puzzled speculation. In particular vv. 1138–1139 have proved too troubling to some commentators as to be regarded as authentic. Paley, reviewing the problems associated with these lines, concludes: "These two verses are

---

ignores the possibility of a connection with ἀραρίσκω, stressing that adjectives with -ήρης tend simply to intensify the meaning of the "Stamm," in this case, ἀμφ-; cf. his similar remarks in *Euripides Ion*, p. 141. Paley[2] 3, p. 25, concurs, essentially considering the adjective no more than an intensifier of πέριξ but, in his commentary on *Ion* 1128 (Paley[2] 2, p. 83), offers a fuller explanation of *HF* 243–"wood piled up or fitted on every side of an altar"—which would seem to suggest that he takes the idea of joining into consideration after all. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 127, noting that "both passages [*HF* 243 and *Ion* 1128] refer to building operations," retains the association with ἀραρίσκω.

[98] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 1, p. 85, calls Lycus' threat of death-by-fire "herzlich schlecht motivirt," observing further that "wird auch rasch fallen gelassen." Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 126, suggests that Wilamowitz is "too harsh." "The orders here serve their purpose, giving the necessary impetus to dislodge the suppliants." Bond, loc. cit., adds: "From a realistic point of view it is ridiculous; the preparations are excessive, and Parnassus is much too far from Thebes."

[99] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 126, characterizes the verb's use at *HF* 238: "of lofty *superbia*."

undoubtedly spurious."[100] Verrall is indecisive about whether or not they should be retained.[101] Owen, himself in a Verrallian mood, lays out the reasons why *Ion* 1138–1139 have been suspected, one of which is: "An Athenian audience would not have to be told that experts (οἱ σοφοί) said that 100 × 100 = 10, 000."[102] He is certainly right about that.

However, the point would seem rather to be that the dimensions are *squared* accurately, which is not nearly as simple as it might seem to a layperson, and which would require an acquaintance with the knowledge of experts. In an attempt to understand it, I discussed this passage with Michael Crelli, an experienced house-builder and indeed one of the σοφοί, who explained to me the complexities of the process of squaring. Most likely the line refers to the establishment of one side of an intended rectangular area (πλέθρου σταθμήσας), the first step in the process of achieving the requisite four precise 90-degree angles. The complex methods which have been adduced to account for the precision of the Egyptian pyramids, which required constant "squarings" at frequent intervals, present an instructive example.[103] Regarding the language of vv. 1138–1139 Owen wisely adds: "If it is an interpolation, it is not easy to see the reason for it."[104] It is well to recall in this context that in *Frogs* Aristophanes has his Euripides characterize the latter's stylistic innovations in comparable architecturally savvy language. The audience has been prepared for this ponderous appraisal at *Ra.* 799–801, when Aeacus and Xanthias rattle off a list of craftsmen's tools which the two tragedians, Aeschylus and Euripides, might bring to their contest. At *Ra.* 956 "Euripides" proudly refers to his λεπτῶν τε κανόνων ἐσβολὰς ἐπῶν τε γωνιασμούς ("introductions of precise canons and squarings of words"), in a gag line that incidentally argues for the soundness of *Ion* 1138–1139.

As it is, the language of the *Ion* verses becomes less confounding if regarded against the formulaic technical language of building inscriptions, of which it is once again conspicuously reminiscent. At v. 1137 I read the noun εὐγωνίαν with Diggle, following a suggestion by Elmsley,

[100] Paley² 2, p. 84.
[101] Verrall, *The Ion of Euripides*, p. 93.
[102] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 145, following Paley.
[103] Mark Lehner, *The Complete Pyramids* (London, 1997), p. 213, conveniently summarizes the several possible methods by which ancient surveyors could have achieved a right angle; cf. Dieter Arnold, *Building in Egypt. Pharaonic Stone Masonry* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 14–15.
[104] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, 145.

whereas the ms. has the adjective εὐγώνιον, which is found frequently in inscriptions.[105] Whether noun or adjective, however, the fact of extreme rarity remains, and the meaning is not significantly altered. The phraseology μέτρημ' ἔχουσαν τοὺν μέσῳ γε μυρίων / ποδῶν ἀριθμόν of vv. 1138–1139 echoes a formulaic expression found routinely in building inscriptions such as, for example, a fourth-century inscription associated with the construction of a portico at Eleusis (*IG* II^2 1666 A 15, 35, 49, and B 25, 28, 36, 45, and passim), where the word ἀριθμός is followed directly by a number. Such parallels open up the possibility that the expression ὥς λέγουσιν οἱ σοφοί at *Ion* 1139 is a reference to actual methodologies of measuring used by craftsmen, perhaps specifically, architects, given the context.

Euripides is fond of using the substantive σοφοί to refer to skilled craftsmen, as at *Alc.* 348–349, and σοφός to indicate a high degree of artisanal craftsmanship, as in fr. 372. 2–3, from a satyr play, *Eurystheus*, and fr. 125 (*Andromeda*). (We shall return to this topic in Chapter Five.) The same reverential attitude toward the expertise of the artisan/architect lies behind Odysseus' advice to his companions, at *Cy.* 477–478, to "obey the architects" (τοῖσιν ἀρχιτέκτοσιν / πείθεσθ'), be they master craftsmen or master builders—both are possible.[106] This being the only occurrence of the term ἀρχιτέκτων in Euripides makes its adoption here in a satyr play noteworthy; in this instance, though, the "architect" is a wise craftsman in metaphor only, for it is Odysseus, the wiliest of heroes, who is more crafty than craftsman.[107] In antiquity, although "architect," in the modern sense of "designer," is occasionally indicated by the appellation, it is not the predominate meaning. The term most often refers to the chief mason or builder, or the overseer of a building project or of works; it is used only secondarily of "leader" or "prime mover" in a general sense, in conformity with modern usage, as well.[108] From the point of view of linguistics, there can be no mistaking the

---

[105] LSJ, s. vv.; cf. *TLG*. Neither term occurs in A. or S. Epigraphical appearances include *IG* II^2 1666 A 64, 71, 103, and 1675. 21, both fourth-century BC building inscriptions from Eleusis, and *IG* VII 3073. 117–118, a Hellenistic building contract from Lebadeia.

[106] The ancient Greek term "architect" could be used to refer to a master craftsman or overseer of any *technê*; cf. Arist. *Metaph.* 981a31–b1.

[107] In verb form ἀρχιτεκτονέω it occurs in another comic context at Ar. *Pax* 305.

[108] LSJ, s. v. For a discussion of the role of the "architect" in Greek building projects, with emphasis on Epidauros, see Alison Burford, *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros* (Toronto, 1969), pp. 138–145.

title's craft origins, however, since a τέκτων is originally a carpenter.[109] Thus, Plutarch (*Per.* 13. 4) uses the word to refer to one of two groups of artisans (ἀρχιτέκτονας and τεχνίτας) who worked under the leadership of Pheidias, the ἐπίσκοπος of the Periclean building program; the last position is clearly the highest in status, for this project, at least. The verb form ἀρχιτεκτονέω is used by Plutarch (*Per.* 13. 7) to define Mnesicles' position as architect, more in the modern sense, of the Propylaea.

Otherwise, the term makes rare appearances in literature, and is found mostly in inscriptions.[110] In Euripides this kind of terminology has the effect of conveying the notion of the wisdom of deferring to the "master mason" in charge, whether he is a highly placed artisan or another authority figure; in the case of *Cy.* 477–478 that would have to mean, with characteristic immodesty, Odysseus, himself. On the more serious occasion of *Ion* 1137–1139 the technical sophistication of the language that Euripides puts into the mouth of a servant leads to the suspicion that the playwright borrowed it directly from an architect's treatise.[111] In lieu of the survival of any such documents from Classical Greece, the language of building inscriptions provides a fair parallel. Typically, a measurement, a dimension, or another instruction is followed by a formulaic expression such as πρὸς τὸν ἀναγραφέα ὃν ἂν δῷ ἀρχιτέκτων or πρὸς τὰ μέτρα κτλ. ("in accordance with the plan or the measurements made by the architect," *IG* II² 1666 A 48 and 75, and passim), while, in another, an operation is stipulated to be performed "in the presence of the architect" (παρόντος τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος, *IG* VII 3073. 130–131 [partially restored]). Language such as this perfectly matches the spirit of *Ion* 1138–1139.

Having advanced his work methodically, thoughtfully, and with a proper degree of reverence for its sacred setting (σεμνῶς, v. 1133), with the frame in place, Ion proceeds to the task of covering the tent, removing for this purpose sacred weavings from "the treasuries" (*Ion* 1141)—the little storage buildings which protected a city's portable votive offerings

---

109 On the Indo-European root *tek(s)- ("fit, join") used to indicate the activity of a carpenter, see Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, MD, and London, 1979), pp. 298–299.

110 LSJ, s. v.; cf. *TLG*; it does not occur in A. or S., although the verb form has been restored at A. fr. 281a. 16 (*TrGF* 3). Building inscriptions in which ἀρχιτέκτων appears include *IG* II² 1666 A and B, passim, and 1675. 29, both associated with a fourth-century portico at Eleusis; *IG* IV² (I) 102 A 9, which concerns the fourth-century temple of Asclepios at Epidauros, and *IG* VII 3073. 131, a Hellenistic building contract from Lebadeia.

111 So Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 282: "... the Servant is naturally pleased to have picked up some technical language, which he faithfully reports ...".

of great value and a familiar sight at Delphi—and arranged them over the armature. To judge from the implied size of these weavings, and the apparent ease with which they are draped, it seems probable that they were tapestries rather than embroideries or piled carpets, although the last is not out of the question.[112] Putting aside our own preconceptions about the appropriate place for carpets and rugs, that is, the floor, it is worth remembering that in modern times nomadic tribes in the Middle East still employ knotted-pile rugs and soumaks as tents and in all manner of furnishings for tents, and that they are used indiscriminately on both floors and walls. In antiquity the Persian tents constructed of decorative weavings of all varieties which became part of the spoils of Plataea, and which so awed the Greeks who were seeing such things *in situ* and in great abundance for the first time (Hdt. 9. 80–83), will come to mind.[113]

Of Ion's tent we are told that one, obviously huge, textile was thrown over the roof, where it extended "wing-like" (πτέρυγα) over the edges (v. 1143);[114] that others hung at the sides, functioning as walls (vv. 1158–1159); and that another was draped above or in the doorway (v. 1163). Compared to the detailed characterization of the formation of the infrastructure, discussed above, and the description of the imagery decorating the textiles which is the subject of the ekphrasis to follow, the language used to describe the draping of the tent with the textiles is sparing. The missing precision has caused some confusion in the conceptualization of the tent's final physical appearance. Contributing to the confusion is the somewhat curious use of the dative at v. 1143 (ὀρόφῳ), as if the tapestries were thrown *on* a roof as opposed to *being* the roof, and of the prepositional phrase τοίχοισιν δ' ἔπι ("on the walls," v. 1158), used of the place-

[112] Margaret C. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC. A Study in Cultural Receptivity* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), pp. 79–80, discusses the evidence for the oriental importation of the art of embroidery into Greece and its relatively late arrival there, only "by the end of the fifth century."

[113] Miller, *Athens and Persia*, p. 55.

[114] Scheid and Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus*, pp. 25 and 66, propose a linguistic similarity between σκέπασμα (which they translate as "fabric") and στέγασμα ("roof") and a symbolic significance of using a garment as a roof in nuptial contexts. A parallel might be the linguistic coincidence of ἱστός as the word for both "loom" and "mast," and consequently of ἱστίον as both "cloth" and "sail," in the ancient sources which attest the use of the great Panathenaic peplos as a sail and the resulting confusion about this issue, on which see Barber, "The Peplos of Athena," p. 114, and further below. On the use of ἱστός for loom, see E.J.W. Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles* (Princeton, 1991), pp. 269–270 and 280.

ment of the tapestries at the sides of the tent, even though it seems obvious that these things functioned as substitutes for real walls rather than as coverings for them.[115] These are matters which can easily be attributed to poetic license. On the other hand the use of the term "peploi" at v. 1143 to describe the tapestry on the roof is entirely a realistic touch, since a peplos was simply a rectangle of cloth and the Panathenaic peplos was for all intents and purposes a large figured tapestry much like these. Furthermore, as we are told they were spoils (σκυλεύματ') of the Amazons, it is not out of the question that they were actual garments.

One final problem concerning the tent's construction is whether the artifact placed κατ' εἰσόδους (v. 1163) refers to a textile, a statuary group, or some other class of portable object. Some have argued that we should think of a sculptural work rather than a woven one, citing the subject matter of this artifact, Kekrops coiling his tail (σπείραισιν εἱλίσσοντ', v. 1164) and flanked by his daughters, which is characterized as "a dedication (ἀνάθημα) of some Athenian," as well as the use of the verb ἔστησε ("positioned") in v. 1166.[116] The idea is tempting: Because of their prominence in Athenian foundation myths, snakes have a long history in sculpted form on the acropolis. The *Ion* image certainly does bring to mind the so-called "Bluebeards" group and other snaky themes from the Archaic poros pediments on the acropolis, where, not incidentally, the serpentine opponents of Heracles were the preferred iconographical subjects among the labors and *parerga*. Coiling snakes decorated both the headdress of Athena and the edges of an aegis that is draped over her extended left arm in the slightly later Gigantomachy pediment, and Pheidias' cult statue of Athena Parthenos included a large snake coiled inside the shield which Pausanais (1. 24. 7) assumed was Erichthonios, to name just the more well-known examples. It is also possible that the olive tree featured in the Parthenon's west pediment was encircled by a snake.[117] One notes especially the tautological emphasis on coiling

[115] Regarding *Ion* 1158, the tapestries forming the sides, Owen's, *Euripides Ion*, p. 146, slightly misleading phrase "hung on the ὀρθοστάται" refers back to the Greek term as it appears at v. 1134, where it is used of the armatures positioned at the sides of the tent. One should not think at all of orthostates in the normal sense, as the first course of a real wall.

[116] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 147; Anne P. Burnett, *Ion by Euripides* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970), p. 101; Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 285, who points to the use of the verb and punctuates his text accordingly (cf. Diggle).

[117] Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis*, p. 177, dismisses the fragment, shown in his fig. 144, which has often been associated with the lost sculpture as Roman in date, as does Olga Palagia, *The Pediments of the Parthenon* (Leiden, 1993), pp. 46–47. However,

(σπείραισιν εἱλίσσοντ') in the description of the body of Kekrops at v. 1164. However, as we are told that Ion removed only ὑφάσματα from the treasury, and given the fact that most ekphrases are restricted to a single work of art or ensemble in the same medium, I see no compelling reason to conclude that we are to imagine anything other than a textile at *Ion* 1163–1165. As for ἔστησε in v. 1166, I prefer the punctuation of Kovacs over Diggle's, associating the verb *only* with the placing of the gold craters inside the tent at vv. 1165–1166, not with the positioning of the art work at or over the door in the lines just previous.[118]

At any rate we soon discover why it is that these textiles were "wondrous for men to behold" (v. 1142): They were woven with numerous γράμμασιν ("drawings" or "stories," v. 1146) of narrative scenes from Greek mythology and cosmology whose description forms the ekphrasis proper. The textile which formed the roof—a gift from Heracles taken from the Amazons—contained elaborate cosmological imagery; the textiles which formed the walls, from a "barbarian" source, depicted a naval battle involving Greeks and hunting scenes including a phantasmagoria of Asiatic human/animal composite creatures; while over the entrance, as we have already noted, appeared snaky-tailed Kekrops and his daughters. The potential symbolism and dramatic intent behind the iconography of the imagery has been dealt with often and at great length; it need not detain us here.[119] The depicted imagery is presented as if we readers/listeners are eyewitnesses to its production, even though the tapestries are obviously already extant. This intentional ambiguity of time is at least in part an act of homage to the manner of Homer's ekphrasis on the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18, where we are witness to the act of creation, but more significantly an indication that Euripides, in his attempt to reconstitute with words the record of the creative process, is reminding us of the importance of the role of the craftsman in the production of such splendid artifacts. His choice of verb tense contributes to this partic-

---

a hydria in St. Petersburg, illustrated by Palagia (op. cit., fig. 10, with p. 44), which may be influenced by the pediment, shows this feature. Palagia (op. cit., p. 42, with figs. 76–79) does sanction the restoration of a fragment of a snake between figures B, which she identifies as Kekrops, and C of the west pediment.

[118] Kovacs, *Euripides*, 4.

[119] On the significance of the iconography, see Mastronarde, "Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*"; Barbara Goff, "Euripides' *Ion* 1132–1165: The Tent," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 34 (1988), 42–54; Zeitlin, "Mysteries of Identity," pp. 166–169 and 174–177, and "The Artful Eye." Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, pp. 360–361, argues on behalf of the plausibility of the textiles.

ipatory aspect of the ekphrasis. The interlaced present, aorist (primarily), and imperfect tenses of the verbs are used of Ion's actions and in the other narrative portions of the servant's account, whereas, in general, the tense used consistently throughout the ekphrasis is a durative tense, the imperfect, rather than an aoristic tense, as if to emphasize the perpetual aspect of the activities portrayed on the textiles and perhaps implying, like the figures on Keats' urn, a secret, forever immanent, potential to come to life.[120] Hence, the abrupt return to the aorist at v. 1159 (ἤμπισχεν) signals that we have emerged from the timeless world of depicted imagery and are returning to real time, or, at least, real narrative time.

Throughout *Ion* Euripides demonstrates again and again that he is interested in dramatizing the *material* aspects of the cult of Apollo at Delphi, including the buildings, the architectural statuary, the votives, the ritual implements and accouterments, a sampling of the items stored in the numerous treasuries, which he itemizes as if with an archaeologist's faith in the telling nature of even the most humble artifactual evidence, if not always with an archaeological accuracy. In the wry phrasing of Verrall, Euripides represents Delphi "as essentially an institution for profit."[121] Little wonder, given the playwright's concern for authenticity, that the existence of elaborately figured votive textiles stored in the treasuries of Delphi can be documented. Athenaeus (2. 48b) writes of two Cypriots, Helicon and his father, Acesas, who excelled in the craft of weaving.[122] As proof of Helicon's celebrity as a craftsman, Athenaeus quotes an inscription woven into a textile by Helicon in which the weaver attributes his skills to Athena. That artifact, according to Athenaeus,

[120] Kovacs', *Euripides*, 4, translation reflects this, as well. In a study of the distinction in "aspect," or "kind of action," between the durative and the aoristic tenses of the Greek verb, with a focus on Thucydides, Jesse L. Rose, "The Durative and Aoristic Tenses in Thucydides," *Language* 18, suppl. 1 (1942), 7–8, observes: "The duration that leads to the use of a durative tense is not in the action itself but in the mind of the speaker or writer." He continues: "A durative tense is essentially a tense of vision, a tense in which the narrator or writer sees the action going on before his eyes." Later, in a discussion of the interweaving of tenses as a characteristic of the style of Thucydidean narrative, Rose, op. cit., p. 30, adds: "The imperfect … is descriptive and lingering; it stops and contemplates; it is concerned with the duration of the act, as the aorist is with the attainment of the act."

[121] A.W. Verrall, *Euripides the Rationalist* (Cambridge, Eng. 1913), p. 242.

[122] For the ancient testimonia about these two craftsmen, see Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 209–210. As Karl Schefold, *Gods and Heroes in Late Archaic Greek Art*, trans. Alan Griffiths, (Cambridge, Eng., 1992), p. 55, notes: "In later times the names of Akesas and Helikon became proverbial for any kind of good workmanship." The two are also credited in Roman times as the first to fabricate the Panathenaic peplos (Zen. *Proverbs* 1. 56).

was deposited at Delphi, thereby offering evidence that treasures indeed served as repositories for valuable, intricately woven textiles of which Euripides and his audience could easily have had knowledge and which might have inspired the *Ion* ekphrasis.

The impression of conformance with real-life practices is deepened when, at *Ion* 1143–1145, the textile thrown over the roof that becomes the first subject of the ekphrasis is described by the servant as an ἀνάθημα ("dedication") of Heracles to Apollo, using language that is identical with that of actual inscribed dedications; perhaps this bit of information was similarly woven in, its presence subsumed under the generalizing γράμμασιν of v. 1146. Only a woven work of art, not an item of everyday use, would be deemed of sufficient quality to be dedicated to the gods, housed in treasuries at Delphi, and worthy of an ekphrasis suitable for this holy place. In the famous scene at Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 922–927 the beauty and extravagance (ποικίλοις ... κάλλεσιν) of the weavings laid out for the king to tread upon suggests that they were meant for the eyes of the gods,[123] as Agamemnon himself acknowledges, in a futile effort to desist from embarking on the fateful path: θεούς τοι τοῖσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεών ("It is the gods, I assure you, who are meant to be honored thus," *Ag.* 922). On the other hand the servant in *Ion*, though admitting that the weavings are sacred dedications, is careful to point out that they are wondrous things for *men* (ἀνθρώποις, v. 1142) to behold, and he proceeds with impunity to describe their decoration.

What kinds of crafted objects might have passed through the visual memory banks of the members of the original audience of *Ion* upon hearing the ekphrasis on the tent weavings? While tapestries from this period are not preserved, perhaps the closest approximations available to us are the Pazyryk carpet and felts, found frozen in a grave in the Altai mountains in Mongolia and now in the Hermitage, the former being the only extant substantially preserved example of a fifth-century BC woolen knotted-pile rug with a figured design.[124] The broad border

[123] Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 2, p. 417, who cites Eupolis fr. 333 K [= *PCG* 5, fr. 363]: τὰ κάλλη τὰ περίσεμνα τῇ θεῷ, "for the special meaning [of κάλλος] with which we are dealing here."

[124] On the Pazyryk textiles, see Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, pp. 199–203; Gerold Walser, "Persische Teppiche als Quelle für die griechische Geschichte?," *Klio* 82 (2000), 54–72. Scholarly work on the Pazyryk carpet by experts on knotted pile rugs includes Ulrich Schurmann, *The Pazyryk, Its Use and Origin* (Munich, 1982); Ludmila Barkova, "The Pazyryk—Fifty Years On," *Hali* 107 (1999), 64–69, with excellent recent color

friezes of mounted riders and animals in the Pazyryk carpet and the phantasmagoric quality of the animals depicted in the fragmentary felts might be taken to be evocative of the "barbarian" style (βαρβάρων ὑφάσματα, v. 1159) of the tent's sides.[125]

Aristophanes' Euripides seems to be alluding to animal friezes of the sort found in the Pazyryk group at *Ra.* 937–938: οὐχ ἱππαλεκτρυόνας μὰ Δί' οὐδὲ τραγελάφους, ἅπερ σύ, / ἃν τοῖσι παραπετάσμασιν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς γράφουσιν· ("Not horse-cocks, by Zeus, nor even goat-deer, such as yours, the sorts of things which they represent in Median textiles"), an intended swipe at Aeschylus' high-blown language which "accidentally on purpose," perhaps, also brings to mind the ekphrasis on the tent in Euripides' *Ion*. Dover translates παραπετάσμασιν as "(wall-)hangings" and compares Hdt. 9. 82, where the same term is used of figured (ποικίλα) textiles among the goods captured from the Persian general, Mardonius, after Plataea.[126] Note that these textiles also are "drawn" (γράφουσιν), like those in the *Ion* ekphrasis. The κρεκάδι' αὐλῆς that Anticleon invites Procleon to admire in the process of the latter's learning to recline properly on a couch (Ar. *V.* 1215) are also likely some sort of figured tapestries or rugs hanging at the recliner's eye level, that is, on the wall (hence, αὐλῆς). MacDowell observes of this passage that it is "the earliest evidence for the use of textile hangings to decorate a Greek room," and adds, plausibly, that Hdt. 9. 82 "seems to imply that such decoration was unknown in Greece at the time of the Persian wars."[127]

The profusion of informative details concerning the dimensions of the tent, the laborious processes behind its construction, and the imagery depicted on the textiles that form its sides and roof, has the cumulative effect of producing a mental image of a credible, realistic structure.

---

photographs. Cf. the depiction of Pan at a symposium seated on a knotted-pile rug, complete with figured animal designs and ornamental borders, on an late fourth-century Apulian vase sold at Sotheby's, London, illustr. *Hali* 14 (1992), 81.

[125] Testimonia about oriental carpets and textiles in the oriental style in Greek contexts have been ably collected and discussed by Friedrich v. Lorentz, "ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ ΥΦΑΣΜΑΤΑ," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 52 (1937), 165–222.

[126] Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, p. 309.

[127] Douglas M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford, 1971), p. 288, who cites W. Kendrick Pritchett, "The Attic Stelai," *Hesperia* 25 (1956), 178–317 (248–249), for additional testimonia for textiles used as indoor furnishings, all however "later than *Wasps*."

It seems that Euripides is making the most of his and his audience's familiarity with the topography and customs of the most important panhellenic sanctuary of the ancient world. Adding to the believability of the tent in a kind of paradoxical way is the otherwise inexplicable observation that it could hold the entire population of Delphi, whatever that could mean, as only a handful of priests, the pythia, and Ion seem actually to have resided there. While not to be counted necessarily as a realistic touch (unless we are overlooking some major body of evidence), the point is well taken as a hybperbolic boast about the size of the tent. Such a bold claim may be expected to strike a contemporary audience as preposterous and even humorous unless they were somehow acquainted with the existence of such large-scale, temporary structures, whether at Delphi or elsewhere. The colossal, tapestry-draped pavilion erected in Alexandria for a celebratory procession of Ptolemy II Philadelpheus (Ath. 5. 196a–b) is described in terms strikingly similar to Ion's tent. Though our primary sources for outdoor tents used for large gatherings date from the Hellenistic period and later, comparable structures are not hard to imagine for the Classical period, as well.[128]

In the tradition of most ekphrases, Euripides' stakes the genre's effectiveness upon a certain degree of plausibility in the object/s described. The intentional extraordinariness of the literary artifact is only made apparent if an audience can successfully summon to mind visual comparanda in the form of real achievements of real craftsmen, if not necessarily an actual match. This is not to say that some stretching of the imagination is not required. The power of ekphrasis as a literary device lies in its capacity to conjure up ornamental visual signs through the effective deployment of ornamental verbal signs. The verbal signs are embellished just enough to encourage the audience to envision artifacts beyond the normal, in the realm of the exceptional, but short of the unbelievable. Evidence both written and archaeological fully endorses the plausibility of the ekphrasis on the tent, Euripides' showpiece featuring the medium of weaving and textiles, and therefore the likelihood that real objects and actual practices inspired all of his references to weaving, most pointedly in a play whose plot is intricately woven around them.

[128] Hellenistic sources are cited by Burnett, *Ion by Euripides*, p. 99. Rainer Graefe, *Vela Erunt. Die Zeltdächer der römischen Theater und ähnlicher Anlagen* (Mainz am Rhein, 1979), contains a wealth of information about all types of tents and awnings of the Roman period.

The Art of Weaving

With the tent weavings given unexpected prominence within the greater narrative of the erection of the tent, a number of seemingly casual references and allusions to weaving in *Ion*—gone unremarked, perhaps, by the audience thus far—suddenly take on significance. At vv. 196–197, in the course of the ekphrasis on the decoration of the temple of Apollo, the entering chorus of Athenian women express awe at the possibility that they might indeed be looking at real-life sculptural representations of stories about Heracles and Iolaus that until now they have only experienced "beside the woof" (παρὰ πήναις). Two possible interpretations have been offered for this passage and for the comparable one at *Ion* 507: (1) That it refers to stories that the women related to each other as they were weaving in part to relieve the monotony of the effort; and (2) that myths such as these were actually the subject matter of figured weavings, so that, in a semiotic sense, the pictures do "tell" their stories.[129] The second seems to me more likely, however remote the possibility that ordinary women would find themselves weaving figured garments on par with the Panathenaic peplos. This is an ekphrasis, already involving two art forms. An even more complex *paragone* situation is set into motion by the implied comparison among, now, three art forms, sculpture, weaving, and poetry (not to mention poetry within poetry, the woven "tales"), allowing for several additional layers of potential imaginative reflection on the verbal/visual paradox that is at the heart of the ekphrasis as a literary figure.

The passages from *Ion* represent subtle variations on the well-worn "singing shuttle" topos, of which Euripides is especially fond. In one form or another it appears, literally in fr. 528a (*Meleager*) (κερκίδος ἀοιδοῦ μελέτας), and more suggestively in fr. 752f. (*Hyps.*) 9–14, as well as at *IT* 222–224 and *IA* 788–790. The *locus classicus* for the expression itself is Aristotle's *Poetics* (1454b36–37); it appears among a list of various tokens of recognition used in Greek tragedy, where it is thought to be a direct quotation by Aristotle from a lost play by Sophocles, *Tereus*, on the rape of Philomela. The story goes that the perpetrator, Tereus, cut out Philomela's tongue in order to keep his victim from revealing the crime, but Philomela was able to relate her woeful tale in spite of lacking a real voice by weaving an account of the rape into a tapestry.

---

[129] Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 180; Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 85. Cf. *IA* 788–790 and *Hec*. 466–475, discussed below.

Sophocles, according to Aristotle, refers to this textile as "the voice of the shuttle" (ἡ τῆς κερκίδος φωνή).[130] The tragic predicament resolved by the "voice of the shuttle" in the story of Philomela and Tereus might help to explain Hecuba's words to Agamemnon at *Hec.* 836–838. There, the Trojan matriarch expresses longing for a voice everywhere in her body so that all parts of her body, including her footsteps, might speak, whether by the art of Daidalos or from some divinity, to plead for justified vengeance upon Polymestor, the murderer of her son, Polydorus. Her captor is impressed with her rhetoric and moved by her obvious suffering, but remains selfishly resolute against complying with her request; Hecuba is left to plot the revenge she seeks on her own.

In another, seemingly offhand occurrence of the language of weaving prior to the tent ekphrasis, Creusa, in an appeal to her servants, addresses them as "trusty slaves of my own loom and shuttle" (*Ion* 747–748). The appearance of the adjective "trusty" (πιστόν) in direct association with weaving—a crown of flattery that this, by reputation, craftiest of crafts wears uneasily—harks back to the earlier "voice of the shuttle" passages. What stories are "told" at the loom among a group of women emboldened by a male-imposed camaraderie, whether they are "related" in the fabric, itself, or voiced by the women doing the work, whether they are grandiose mythological sagas or local gossip. these are secrets to be entrusted only to the other women with whom one shares one's intimate quarters and much of one's life. Yet lest any audience member overlook the irony posed by the juxtaposition of "trust" and "weaving," in stark antithesis to the prevailing clichés of the day, the deceitful side of weaving, the one more familiar to Greek males, is brought to bear on a couple of occasions in *Ion*. The first is a metaphor for what temporarily seems an elaborately deceptive plot engaged in by Creusa's foreign-born husband, Xuthus, in an effort to gain the throne of Athens for his own line. In describing the apparent plot in detail to Creusa, her old servant, exasperated, concedes:

---

[130] The actual words of Sophocles are κερκίδος φωνή (fr. 595), as Tyrwhitt recognized in 1794 (*TrGF* 4, p. 444, ad loc.; cf. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 1, p. 238). On the "singing shuttle" motif, see Geoffrey H. Hartman, *Beyond Formalism. Literary Essays 1958–1970* (New Haven and London, 1970), pp. 337–355; Scheid and Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus*, pp. 111–130. On the relationship between weaving and song in early Greek poetry, see Jane M. Snyder, "The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets," *Classical Journal* 76 (1980–1981), 193–196. Anthony Tuck, "Singing the Rug: Patterned Textiles and the Origins of Indo-European Metrical Poetry," *American Journal of Archaeology* 110 (2006), pp. 539–550, offers a wide-ranging historical account of the motif and clarifies many of its technical aspects. In general on the rhapsode tradition, Nagy, *Plato's Rhapsody*, is useful.

"Such are the webs he did weave" (κἄπλεκεν πλοκὰς / τοιάσδ', *Ion* 826–827). Using the same language, more literally, of plaiting rather than weaving, but the skills are virtually interchangeable, Ion admonishes his mother at v. 1410, at the outset of their recognition scene: "Stop weaving … deceits!" (παῦσαι πλέκουσα … πλοκάς), a choice of language whose appearance at this point in the play veers toward punning, in light of the role of real weavings in the exchange concerning the tokens of proof soon to follow. The theme recurs a few lines later in Ion's terse prompt in response to Creusa's triumphant naming of the first of the items in the basket: "What sort? Manifold are the weavings of virgins" (ποῖόν τι; πολλὰ παρθένων ὑφάσματα, v. 1418). This, after he had just warned her against "weaving wiles" implies that, from a male point of view, a typical young woman's "woven" repertory might extend to words of all manner and form as well as images, that is, "designs" in all senses of the term. There is an unmistakable undertone of acerbity beneath Ion's stichomythic replies in the recognition scene with his mother. At moments like these Ion comes across as a rather less offensive member of a peculiar class of misogynistic Euripidean male, company which would arguably include Jason, Hippolytus, Admetus, and Pentheus. On the other hand, the hostility in his tone toward Creusa may be owed to the fact that she has just been implicated in the attempt on his life.

The effectiveness of this climactic scene, and of Ion's remark at *Ion* 1418, in particular, would depend upon an audience's being acquainted to some degree with weaving practices in real life. Evidence both literary and archaeological strongly suggests that any properly bred Greek girl in real life would be in possession of a substantial repertory of designs, patterns, and figures from which to select decorative motifs as befit the weaving project at hand. At *El.* 538–540 the old man asks Electra if she could identify textiles that she herself wove for her brother, Orestes.[131] They were obviously unique. Her sister Iphigenia, at *IT* 811–817, to be discussed shortly, trumpets her weaving skills. Creusa also obviously did her own weaving. This image dovetails neatly with the visual evidence provided by the elaborately ornamented dresses worn by the votive korai from the Athenian acropolis, most of them aristocratic thank-offerings. To the list of visual correlatives may be added the tiny lekythos by the Amasis Painter in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

[131] Curiously, at *El.* 307 Electra mentions having to weave her clothes herself (αὐτή) as one of the outward signs of how she has fallen in her present circumstances.

(MMA 48), which depicts peploi-makers at work with their products on view displaying a similar heterogeneity of patterns woven into the garments.[132]

Other vase paintings also attest to the variety of patterns in woven garments, which Barber, a leading authority on textiles in the ancient world and a weaver herself, has conveniently brought together. These include a cup by Makron (British Museum E-140) showing Demeter wearing a cloak covered with parallel horizontal figured friezes of various subjects, a format which Barber suggests was most likely used for the Gigantomachy on the Panathenaic peplos; a skyphos attributed to the Penelope Painter in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Chiusi (inv. no. 1831), showing Telemachos and his mother in front of a loom containing a cloth being woven with a figured frieze. The reverse of the famous amphora by Exekias in the Vatican (Vat. Mus. Gregoriano Etrusco 16757), illustrating the Dioscuri at home with their parents, showing Leda attired in an especially ornamental peplos, could also be added, as well as the familiar François Vase (Florence, Arch. Mus. 4209), where a goddess arriving at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis wears a peplos woven with a pattern of stacked chariot friezes.[133] The manner of arranging the scenes on the François vase is itself reminiscent of the way the figured friezes are arranged on the garments as depicted by the vase painters, suggesting a close connection between the art of figured weaving and the style of decoration of early figured vases, and even a line of influence extending from the former to the latter.

Ion is not the only Euripidean play in which figured weavings, or a memory of them, play a role in a recognition scene. A similar scene in *Iphigenia Among the Taurians* offers an instructive comparison. At *IT* 811–817 Iphigenia and her brother Orestes together explore their early memories in search of tokens of proof of a common childhood that would certify a fraternal relationship between them. In the process two weavings are introduced, each the work of Iphigenia, whose subjects, when recalled to her by her brother, help to convince her of his identity. The passage

---

[132] On which see Dietrich von Bothmer, *The Amasis Painter and his World. Vase-Painting in Sixth-Century BC Athens* (Malibu, CA, 1985), pp. 185–187, with illustrations.

[133] For an analysis of the textiles depicted on the cup by Makron, see Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, pp. 363–365, and "The Peplos of Athena," p. 115, with fig. 73; and on the skyphos attributed to the Penelope Painter, Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, p. 104, with fig. 63. The reverse of the Exekias amphora is illustr. in Simon et al., *Die griechischen Vasen*, fig. 74; on the obverse is the scene of Ajax and Achilles playing dice discussed in the previous chapter. The François Vase is well illustr. in Simon et al., op.cit., figs. 52–57.

is noteworthy for its profusion of technical weaving terms, as itemized by Miller, who noticed thereby "the fine details of the weaver's craft that the artist poet brings out."[134] Unlike the items featured in *Ion*, however, whose rather simplified decoration (a snaky border and a gorgoneion, *Ion* 1421, 1423) would have seemed plausible to a fifth-century Athenian, in *IT*, both woven subjects present the weaver with a level of technical difficulty comparable to the Gigantomachy on the Panthenaic peplos; thus, we must assume either that Iphigenia was a very talented artist or that iconography, in this case, is more crucial to Euripides' dramatic intentions than strict realism. One weaving features the story of the strife between Atreus and his brother, Thyestes, of the accursed Atridae, back to whom the two young people may trace their current predicament; the other, whose imagery is more iconic than narrative, is of the sun reversing its course in the sky (μετάστασιν, *IT* 816). Iphigenia, for her part, remembers the latter particularly well, to judge from her response: "I wove also this design with fine threads intertwined" (ὕφηνα καὶ τόδ' εἶδος εὐμίτοις πλοκαῖς, v. 817). Unlike the recognition scene in *Ion* between mother and son, where the inquisitor, Ion, barely manages to contain his haughty skepticism while his mother is tremulous and obsequious in her responses, the scene between Iphigenia and Orestes is hopeful and even-handed from beginning to end, with the escalating tone of the remembrances reaching for a crescendo of proof that finally renders incontestable an instinctual familiarity that was latent from the beginning.

To return to *Ion*, with the introduction of a woven token of proof as one of three (the others being a snaky child's necklace and an olive wreath) that lead to filial recognition, the weaving motif arrives at its teleological destination. All of the references and allusions to the craft now make perfect dramatic sense and incidentally contribute yet another unifying sub-theme to an already tightly wrought Euripidean plot. In hindsight the ekphrasis on the tent serves as an extravagant poetic flourish that caps a developing motif which had until then made its presence known only through modest hints, as if biding its time, awaiting full fruition only in the play's climactic dénouement. In a way the ekphrasis may be regarded as proleptic: Its innate attractiveness beguiles the audience into considering the potentially deeper significance of the generally unheralded,

[134] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 676. For an astute and sensitive analysis of the dramatic ramifications of the woven tokens, see Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia*, pp. 267–270.

womanly art of weaving in advance of the plot's revealing what exactly that significance is to be. The ekphrasis on the tent represents a virtuoso crest of a slow-moving wave of seemingly casual references to weaving, literally and dramatically prefiguring the role that the most female of crafts will play, fittingly, in the pivotal moment between a mother and son in their recognition scene. There is great, if quiet drama in this moment: Actual representative samples of the intimate accouterments associated with the earliest, discreet moments between mother and infant child, of little interest to the adult male under normal circumstances, are thrust into the hands of an unwitting young man in a very public arena. Out of place, of another time, this symbol of the maternal bond, the woven coverlet that should by custom have passed from mother to daughter, generation upon generation, until its resilience gives out, makes an uncustomary debut in the full light of the ancient world's most conspicuous stage, the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi—via the theater of Dionysos.

As the recognition scene between mother and son unfolds, Creusa is able to identify the design woven in the coverlet with which the baby Ion was exposed because, of course, she wove it herself. The iconography is quite specific, and appropriately Athenocentric: The textile incorporates a snaky border and a gorgoneion just like Athena's own apotropaic aegis, appropriate for a tiny infant about to be left to nature's mercy; snakes, of course, are also associated with Erichthonios and the House of the Erechtheids that Ion will inherit by the play's end. When we, the audience, learn how a figured weaving helps to certify the blood ties between apparent strangers, and, more importantly, helps to establish an Athenian royal pedigree for the play's protagonist, a humble temple sweeper, we will want to recall and re-evaluate the status of the weaving ekphrasis, along with its imagery, as a prognosticator and analogue of the current state of stage affairs. Like most successful ekphrases, the ekphrasis on the tent in Euripides' *Ion* migrates among various levels of potential valuation; it begins life quite satisfyingly as a literary figure; interpreted, it can serve as an iconographical thesaurus for the work in which it appears, a microcosm to the macrocosm, and it finishes as a critical plot device. Not by accident, this very same progression may be found in the earliest preserved ekphrasis, the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18: (1) exquisite poem within a poem, archetype of the genre; (2) microcosmic encapsulation of the *Iliad*'s plot; and (3) commentary on war and peace and/or practical accouterment which enables the greatest of the Achaeans to return to battle and avenge his friend's death.

The Peplos

The paths of two leading themes of Euripides' *Ion*, weaving and Athenian iconography, converge in one historically documented Athenocentric material object: the Panathenaic peplos.[135] The robe that draped the ancient image of Athena, woven anew every four years by well-born Athenian young women, was decorated exclusively with the Gigantomachy, the epic battle that was regarded as the most important in which the Athenian patron goddess participated. While the peplos is never mentioned directly in *Ion*, this most sacred of textiles is not entirely absent from the play. It is arguably alluded to in the ekphrasis on the temple of Apollo when the chorus spot "their goddess" among the Olympians fighting in the Gigantomachy depicted "on the stony walls" (vv. 206–207, 211); in the detailed descriptions of the elaborate woven mythological scenes, comparable in their intricacy and complexity to the imagery of the peplos, featured in the ekphrasis on the tent; and again at *Ion* 1528–1529, with Creusa's reference to Athena fighting alongside Zeus in the Gigantomachy. These join a plethora of additional references to Athena and her iconography, culminating in an epiphany by the goddess herself as *deus ex machina*, just when we might expect the god of Delphi, Apollo, to put in an appearance, given the play's setting and his crucial role in the story.

There can be no question, however, that the Panathenaic peplos is the referent in a choral strophe in Euripides' *Hecuba* (vv. 466–472).[136] The chorus of captive Trojan women contemplate the range of possible locations in Greece where they might be sent to live out the remainder of their lives in servitude to the slayers of their husbands. The women's knowledge of Greek lands and customs is impressive for foreigners, but such, we must conclude, is the fame of Greek cities abroad, at least from the point of view of an Athenian playwright. The spirit of place permeates each miniature ekphrasis of the choral exchange differently. The various alternatives—Phthia, home of Achilles, Delos, Athens—are spoken of almost wistfully, a not insignificant matter, considering the women's inevitable status as slaves and concubines irrespective of their

---

[135] Cf. Zeitlin, "Mysteries of Identity," p. 186, n. 43.

[136] The following discussion of *Hec.* 466–472 has been reworked from Stieber, *The Poetics of Appearance*, pp. 137–138 and 152–156. Parts of the strophe have been suspected by Martin Lackner, "Eine Interpolation in Euripides, Hecuba 467 f.?," *Rheinisches Museum* 141 (1998), 230–239; they do not, however, affect the present interpretation.

destination. Athens is not named, rather referred to solely as "the city of Pallas;" however, a periphrasis featuring one of the city's most commanding symbols, the Panatheniac peplos, certifies the identification:

> ἢ Παλλάδος ἐν πόλει
> τὰς καλλιδίφρους Ἀθα-
> ναίας ἐν κροκέῳ πέπλῳ
> ζεύξομαι ἅρα πώ-
> λους ἐν δαιδαλέαισι ποι-
> κίλλους' ἀνθοκρόκοισι πή-
> ναις ἢ Τιτάνων γενεάν …
>
> (… or, in the city of Pallas, am I to weave colts yoked to beautiful chariots on the saffron peplos of Athena, or [am I to weave] the race of Titans …, in Daidalic, flower-dyed and spun fibers …)

At *Hec.* 485 the chorus who have just sung these lines are addressed by Talthybius as Τρῳάδες κόραι, a potentially belittling form of address for the γυναῖκες among them who have been widowed at Greek hands. However, on this occasion, the appellation, "korai" seems somehow fitting in light of the naively hopeful timbre of the ode and the kinds of activities the woman anticipate doing: singing, dancing, and weaving. Of course all of this is fanciful, since, as slaves, they would not be eligible to participate in that most prestigious task, the creation of the Panathenaic peplos. And yet they dream. If they should be sent to Athens and put to work on the peplos, the chorus muse over whether each would be assigned to weave a god (Athena in her chariot, vv. 466–470) or a giant (the race of Titans …, vv. 472–474). There is even a subtle hint that the former may be preferred: The description of the work on the gods' side is somewhat more developed than that on the giants' side. At *IT* 222–224 a simplified version of the same periphrasis is used to refer to the peplos.

The colorful language of *Hec.* 470–471 (ἐν δαιδαλέαισι ποικίλλους' ἀνθοκρόκοισι πήναις) does not require us to imagine, incongruously, that flowers were represented in a battle scene: ἀνθοκρόκοισι should rather refer to the threads colored by dyes made from flowers collected by young women.[137] Creusa is caught by Apollo in these very circumstances,

[137] Also recognized by Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, p. 362, and "The Peplos of Athena," p. 103; LSJ, s. v., has "worked with flowers." Scheid and Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus*, pp. 53–58, in their discussion of the epithet *poikilothronos* used of Aphrodite at Sappho fr. 1. 1, argue on behalf of "dressed in a cloak with flowered designs" rather than "seated on a richly worked throne," the latter, once common interpretation put to rest by G.M. Bolling, "*Poikilos* and *Throna*," *American Journal of Philology* 79 (1958), 275–282, followed by Michael C.J. Putnam, "*Throna* and Sappho 1. 1," *Classical Journal* 56 (1960–1961), 79–

at *Ion* 887–890, a passage redolent with the imagery of Sappho, whence she is raped and made pregnant with Ion. The erotic overtones of the activity are unmistakable: "You came to me with your hair shining gold when I was culling into the folds of my dress crocus flowers for dying [lit., for garments to flower] that burst in response with their own golden light" (ἦλθές μοι χρυσῷ χαίταν / μαρμαίρων, εὖτ' ἐς κόλπους / κρόκεα πέταλα φάρεσιν ἔδρεπον / ἀνθίζειν χρυσανταυγῆ·). In this case φάρεσιν with epexegetical ἀνθίζειν, though a difficult locution, probably refers to the use of flowers for dyeing clothes (LSJ s. v., i. 2), rather than, as Owen appears to take it, as the garments somehow being strewn with flowers, a mistake, I believe, which is commonly made also with reference to *Hec.* 466–474.[138]

At *Ion* 1528–1529 Creusa alludes to Athena's role in the Gigantomachy in similar terms to the *Hecuba* chorus, by way of a reference to the goddess' fighting alongside her father in a chariot. At that point in the play, the audience will be reminded both of the sculpted Gigantomachy described by the chorus in the parodos as well as of the well-known decoration of the Panathenaic peplos of their own day. A modest echo of the sacred peplos' woven imagery may be detected in the unusual chariot frieze decorating the chiton of acropolis kore 686, which, aside from the most meager of traces, has all but disappeared.[139] The description of Penelope Dimitriou in 1947 when it was still visible is therefore invaluable: "at neckline, [a] maeander accompanied by painted figure frieze of chariot race within black outlining bands, once painted figures

---

83. The main comparandum is *Il.* 22. 441, where similar language is used of a cloak Andromache weaves for Hector. However, these writers fail to distinguish clearly between the two very different notions implied by their translation: the difference between (1) floral *designs* and (2) multi-colored, floral-produced *dyes*.

[138] Diggle obelizes ἀνθίζειν, Kovacs, ἀνθίζειν χρυσανταυγῆ; both are accepted by Murray. James Diggle, "On the 'Heracles' and 'Ion' of Euripides," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philologial Society*, n. s. 20 (1974), 3–36 (23, n. 2), troubled by the entire construction and dissatisfied with the solutions of others, tentatively suggests a nominative middle, ἀνθιζομένα, in order to retain the sense of "culling flowers," which would be redundant, with ἔδρεπον, and, moreover, unnecessary. My interpretation matches that of Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 49, with n. 31, who does not obelize. As Barlow (loc. cit.) points out, ἀνθίζειν (and ἄνθος) are used of dyeing (in this case, the purple of mollusks), at Arist. *HA* 547a18–28. Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 129, takes φάρεσιν two ways: (1) almost equivalent to a subjective genitive with κόλπους or (2) "to deck my robes," as if the robes were strewn with actual flowers. Another possibility is that the robe is decorated with woven floral motifs, hence, "decked" with flowers.

[139] Brinkmann, *Die Polychromie*, no. 107, with an earlier (1887) reconstruction drawing and a more recent one showing what is currently visible.

on dark-stained (originally blue) background; red on horses' manes, tails, bridles and reins."[140] For a young woman to sport chariots as a decorative pattern on her dress begs for explanation; chariot iconography is more naturally associated with males. However, in Athens, a chariot in and of itself would function as a reminder of the role of the patron goddess in the Gigantomachy, especially, one might suspect, when it is found in a female context, and most especially, on the acropolis. This would account for its appearance on a votive kore from the acropolis, and, by extension, on real life female garments.

In both the periphrastic description of the Panathenaic peplos from *Hecuba* and in the oblique allusion to the peplos at *Ion* 1528–1529, the tense used of the depicted imagery described is the durative present.[141] While no verb is actually used of Athena's actions as represented on the robe at *Hec.* 467–470, at vv. 473–474 the present κοιμίζει is used of Zeus' smiting of the Titans; similarly, the present participle is used for Athena's fighting (παρασπίζουσαν) at *Ion* 1528. As well, at *IT* 222–224, another periphrastic reference to the Panathenaic peplos, the relevant verbs are in the present tense (ναίω [v. 219], ποικίλλουσ' [v. 224]). We may recall the use of the durative, imperfect tense, rather than an aoristic tense, in the ekphrasis on the tent. In the discussion there it was also noted that the use of a tense with progressive/repeated (durative) aspect in an ekphrastic context has the effect of suggesting a Keatsian sense of the permanent present inherent in a subject depicted in a work of visual art. The poet who attempts to translate the visual into words is forced to seek a verbal tense that mimics as closely as possible the special capability of the visual arts to transfigure time into timelessness, a capability that is one of the marks of distinction between the visual arts and the verbal. For, unlike the visual artist, the poet must choose a grammatical tense, thereby formally delimiting the time represented (= *sphere* of time) and, more importantly, its aspect (= *kind* of time).[142] In Greek the use of the present or the imperfect tense alone conveys a sense of unfixed time,

---

[140] Penelope Dimitriou, *The Polychromy of Greek Sculpture to the Beginning of the Hellenistic Period* (Diss.: Columbia University, 1947), p. 233. The chariot friezes on the peplos worn by a goddess on the François Vase as well as on Demeter's cloak on a cup by Makron, both mentioned above, may be compared.

[141] For the present indicative as a durative tense, see Rose, "The Durative and Aoristic Tenses," pp. 24–25, and note 120, above.

[142] I adopt the terminology used by W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Thucydides' Pentekontaetia and Other Essays* (Amsterdam, 1995), p. 7, with full bibliographic references, following Gildersleeve's rendering of Stahl's German, "Zeitstufe" and "Zeitart," respectively.

whereas in English, in Keats' "Ode on a Grecian Urn," the paradigm of modern ekphrasis, this is done with multiple repetitions of words like "forever" and with repeated provocative statements about time, among other poetic devices. Through verbal tenses alone, Euripides manages to signal his audience that a work of visual art is being described and to sustain the illusion throughout his transcription of the image.

Many-colored Threads

During the recognition scene, in response to Ion's query about "what sort" of weaving is in the basket, Creusa replies: "Not a finished thing, but a sort of sampler of the shuttle" (οὐ τέλεον, οἷον δ' ἐκδίδαγμα κερκίδος, *Ion* 1419). While the weavings of Greek virgins were indeed manifold, in terms of the range of decorative patterns and colors in the weaver's repertory, part of this variety also resided in differences in degree of quality and fineness of product, as Creusa's response reveals. Significantly, the choice of adjective, τέλεον, is documented as a critical term denoting "perfection" in a work of visual art.[143] Obviously an experienced weaver would be able to produce more finished, perfect work than a novice. And not all experienced weavers were equally skilled. There is abundant testimony throughout Euripides that fine attire, the fruit of the loom, so to speak, was recognized, valued, and acknowledged as an attribute of character, as was the opposite. The playwright makes good dramatic use of this fact of Greek social life.

Some examples will illustrate the point. First, an exchange between Iphis and his daughter Evadne, widow of the fallen Capaneus, just before Evadne's suicidal plunge onto her husband's pyre (*Supp*. 1054–1062). The father senses that something is amiss when he notices that his daughter is dressed inappropriately for a funeral, since, it seems, she is wearing her wedding clothes, which are evidently familiar to him from the earlier occasion.[144] Iphis proceeds to question Evadne on her choice of clothing. He observes that she is dressed not as one in mourning (v. 1056), but instead, the audience is left to deduce, as one being mourned. It seems it is appropriate to be attired in one's wedding clothes for one's own funeral, but not for someone else's. That the "new thing" that Evadne claims she has dressed for (v. 1057) is not a wedding can be inferred from

---

[143] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 262–263.

[144] Cf. Foley, "*Anodos* Dramas," p. 139; Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 377; Morwood, *Euripides Suppliant Women*, p. 225.

her father's worried response: "But you are near a tomb and a pyre." The "beautiful victory" which she then claims to be celebrating (v. 1059) is, as Evadne reveals, when pressed, a victory "over all women" (v. 1061). Iphis' response (v. 1062) reflects what his society valued in womanly skills, but in a surprising order. He thinks first of weaving skills (ἔργοις Ἀθάνας) and only second of good judgment (εὐβουλίᾳ). He is evidently still held in thrall by the disconcertingly fine appearance of his daughter's dress.

So too Clytemnestra's woven finery is noted at *Or.* 840 in the χρυσεοπηνήτων φαρέων of the chorus' description of the dress she dies in at the hands of her son, Orestes. The picturesque adjective, χρυσεοπηνήτων ("gold-threaded"), apparently a coinage of Euripides, alludes to Clytemnestra's royalty but also, according to Willink, enhances "the horror of the event."[145] Willink does not explain how, but he is certainly right: These are precisely the kinds of visually inspired details that contribute to a vigorously realistic picture in the minds of audience members entrusted with envisioning the scene described. Similarly, the peploi out of which Orestes and Pylades pull their swords in their attempt to murder Helen at *Or.* 1457 are described by the Phrygian slave with the vivifying adjective ἀμφιπορφύρων ("purple-bordered").[146]

In another heavily descriptive scene, the peploi which Pylades throws over the maddened Orestes at *IT* 312 are to be visualized as εὐπήνους ὑφάς ("weavings of fine texture").[147] This same phrase, however, is used under very different circumstances at *IT* 1464–1467, a passage much discussed as evidence for a peculiar cultic tradition. Athena is informing Iphigenia that she is to have a career followed by an honorable burial at the shrine of Artemis at Brauron. The goddess observes that an unusually specific type of votive will be offered to Iphigenia at her tomb in the form of "peploi of fine-woven texture" that have been left behind in their houses by women who have died in childbirth. It is generally assumed that unfinished weavings are meant. These would be garments that were begun with the belief that a small child in need of such things would soon arrive, weavings whose progress was interrupted by the event of the birth and thus left unfinished at the death of the mother. Sarah Iles Johnston, who has written extensively on the history and significance of unfinished and previously used garments as dedications by and for young women,

[145] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 223, comparing Iphigenia's saffron robe at A. *Ag.* 239.
[146] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 321, points to depictions of such a garment on vases.
[147] Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia*, p. 127, observes that "the phrase occurs only in this play" and "in the quotation of 312 in [Lucian]."

associates this Euripidean passage with inscriptions at the Brauronian in Athens which "mention that some unfinished pieces of clothing were dedicated there."[148] Creusa's reply at *Ion* 1419, "Not a finished thing, but a sort of sampler of the shuttle," takes on an added poignancy if viewed in light of the woven dedications destined to be offered to Iphigenia in *IT*. For, while Creusa did not die in childbirth, garments intended for a child were of no use to her in her impending childlessness, and as such were effectively "buried" with her son.

As fine as Greek garments were, opulent textiles and fabrics, especially those with figured designs, were more the hallmark of foreigners than of Athenians in the Classical period (in contradistinction with the Archaic), who did not want to be seen to go "soft" like easterners and their emulators through association with such luxurious accouterments. The pithiest statement on the difference between the men of Athens and other, less stalwart types, is the famous line assigned by Thucydides to Pericles in his funeral oration of 431/30 BC (Th. 2. 40. 1): "For we love beauty without extravagance and though we love philosophy we are not soft" (Φιλοκαλοῦμέν τε γὰρ μετ᾽ εὐτελείας καὶ φιλοσοφοῦμεν ἄνευ μαλακίας). Polychromed textiles, with their connotations of royalty or aspirations thereto, would lend themselves particularly well to the charge of extravagance. They are more often than not personal possessions, and, as such, would contribute little or nothing to the "education of Hellas," by comparison with public monuments, whose outward extravagance was also curtailed with legislation on a couple of occasions in democratic-leaning Athens. Anything demonstrating μαλακία was suspect, including cloth. Foldable, drapable fabrics, finely woven and variegated, epitomize the notions of softness and pliancy in a way that stone sculptures, for instance, do not. In Plutarch's *Themistocles* 29. 3 the exiled Greek statesman replies to the Persian king with a simile that compares human speech (τὸν λόγον … τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) with decorated carpets (τοῖς ποικίλοις στρώμασιν).[149] While the immediate allusion is to the longstanding tradition of associating crafty speech with the real-life craft of weaving, the context—a Greek attempting to ingratiate himself with a Persian, in a land where a carpet simile will always have special significance—suggests

---

[148] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, p. 238; Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia*, pp. 458–460, doubts the archaeological authenticity of the ritual.

[149] A.J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal and London, 1975), p. 73, is somewhat skeptical about the authenticity of the anecdotes about Themistocles in Asia. They could be stories of the "roving anecdote" type, described by Hornblower, *Thucydides*, pp. 22–23, but that does not necessarily preclude their being authentic.

an additional layer of interpretation. Just as a figured cloth hides and distorts its patterns, its colors, and its iconography when folded up—as anyone may attest who has seen a folded oriental rug and either been disappointed or pleasantly surprised when it is unfolded—so human language, when it is imperfectly rendered through an interpreter or through the speech of someone who has not mastered a foreign tongue, may distort, confuse or conceal the truth.[150] Thus, Themistocles begs the king for more time to master the Persian language before he reports on the affairs of the Greeks. The simile is apt. Extravagantly figured textiles presented a double threat: Not only were they subject to the appellation μαλακός, but their variegated patterns made them highly susceptible to misrepresentation of content, when draped or folded.

While Asiatics preferred fabric designs that were purely ornamental—animal friezes and the like—Athenians decorated their sacred peplos with a narrative, historicizing event with moral overtones, the Gigantomachy. Moreover, their peplos was displayed flattened out in full view as it was borne to the acropolis as the sail of the Panatheniac ship-cart;[151] there would be no possibility of unintentional misrepresentation. Their native tastes, however, did not prevent the Athenians, along with many other Greeks, from being captivated by flamboyant eastern textiles. Whether the "feminine" allure of these products served to placate their own sublimated effeminacy or whether it served to remind them of their city's reputation for manliness, and thereby encourage resistance to effeminacy, the men of Athens remained fascinated by luxurious tex-

[150] H.A. Holden, *Plutarch's Life of Themistocles* (London, 1881), p. 169, offers a similar interpretation of the simile. Walser, "Persische Teppiche," would like to associate the Pazyryk carpet with the passage, but in the end hesitates to do so on account of its non-Persian designs and place of manufacture, as he argues in an extended analysis.

[151] The date of origin of the practice is still debated, with widely divergent centuries being proposed; Nagy, "A Late Panathenaic Document," p. 107, reviews the testimonia gathered in Adolph Michaelis, *Der Parthenon* (Leipzig, 1871), p. 329, pointing out that the earliest source attesting to the existence of the ship (by inference only) and its unusual sail dates from the fourth century BC. Barber, "The Peplos of Athena," p. 114, with perhaps undue confidence, assigns it to "shortly after the Persian Wars, using one of the boats from the battle of Salamis to celebrate and recall the saving of the city;" she cites no ancient source for this information. T.L. Shear, Jr., "Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 BC," *Hesperia*, suppl. 17 (1978), 39–44, following the lead of earlier scholars, sensibly concludes that the "ship" used to convey the peplos before the Hadrianic period was the same wheeled processional vehicle that was used to carry the image of Dionysos at the Athesteria—a practice which, since it is shown on black-figure vases, dates to as early as the sixth century BC—outfitted for the occasion with ὅπλα (i.e., mast, yard, and ropes); if this is the case, according to Shear, it would suggest "a high antiquity for the Panathenaic ship" (p. 40), as well.

tiles in the same way (and perhaps for much the same reasons) that they remained fascinated by women, while simultaneously reviling them. The chronology of Athenians' acquaintance with these products may be significant for Euripides. Margaret C. Miller, who has studied the phenomenon most extensively, observes: "Certainly by the end of the [fifth] century Near Eastern textiles were much appreciated at Athens; the spoils of Plataia will have provided the first extended contact with them, for all that some textiles may have been imported in the archaic period or captured at Marathon." And, of the late fifth century, when Euripides was still working, Miller adds: "Tantalizing references to materials and clothing that were evidently imported into Athens appear especially in the period from the late fifth century; textiles were the type of import that raised the greatest ancient criticism about the development of a taste for luxury."[152] It seems, then, that Euripides would have been an eyewitness to this initial encounter and the resultant infatuation by fellow Athenians, in spite of themselves, with oriental woven products and the very un-Athenian ethic, and aesthetic they embodied.

"Phrygian," an epithet that included, conspicuously, Trojan, became proverbial in antiquity for the finest of the craft of weaving.[153] The trope is reality-based; there is ample archaeological evidence for textile production in the area.[154] As a trope, and along with all of its ideological baggage, it appears under a number of guises in Euripides' plays; we have already encountered a few examples. Compared with Greek slaves who speak like aristocrats and are exceptionally wise and perceptive, Phrygian slaves (e.g., Helen's servant in *Orestes*), are uncouth, ill-spoken, and not very bright; we are left to infer that these are the very traits that prolonged exposure to "soft" living brings about.[155] Cassandra addresses the chorus of fellow Trojan women as καλλίπεπλοι Φρυγῶν κόραι ("Phrygian girls of the lovely gowns") at *Tr.* 338–339, in an allusion to the prestige of Phrygian weaving. Electra disdainfully describes her mother, Clytemnestra, as seated among Phrygian σκυλεύμασιν ("rugs" or "throws") at *El.* 314, a detail which will be recalled in the imagery of *Or.* 840, just discussed. That these are described as "Phrygian" constitutes a great irony, since her husband led the expedition against Troy, but

---

152 Miller, *Athens and Persia*, pp. 55 and 75.

153 E.g., Pliny 8. 196, who credits the Phrygians with the invention of embroidery.

154 This was no cottage industry, according to Richard B. Burke, "Textile Production at Gordion and the Phrygian Economy," *American Journal of Archaeology* 101 (1997), p. 361 (abstract); for an overview of the evidence, see Miller, *Athens and Persia*, pp. 75–81.

155 Cf. West, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 277.

apparently the queen has been "softened" by exposure to the Asian life style of her new Trojan slaves, awarded as booty to Agamemnon. The slave girls themselves are arrayed in typical Phrygian finery: "Idaean (i.e., Mt. Ida in Phrygia) garments yoked with golden brooches" (*El.* 317–318).

Like the Phrygians, the Thracians were also famed for their woven products. Thucydides (2. 97. 3) speaks of woven textiles, both plain and patterned (ὑφαντά τε καὶ λεῖα), among the "gifts" (δῶρα) which formed part of the Thracian tribute to the Athenian confederacy.[156] While the Thracians were not Asiatics like the Phrygians and Trojans, that they were regarded as non-Greek, and that they had once been part of the Persian empire would be sufficient to account for their apparent taste for luxury in the minds of the Greeks. At *Hec.* 1151–1154 Thracian expertise at the loom becomes the occasion for a small but powerful genre scene that serves as a prelude to the play's horrific climax. Polymestor is recounting to Agamemnon the story of the murder of his sons and his own blinding at the hands of the Trojan women. The Thracian king has been lured into their tent by Hecuba, herself. He soon finds himself in a place he does not belong. Inside, the women sit on chairs, in their midst, suddenly, and ripe to be their prey, a man. Before they strike, the women inspect Polymestor's clothes, drawing the fabric in close before their eyes (ὑπ' αὐγάς) so that they may better inspect the quality of the products of the Thracian shuttle whose fame had reached them. On the pretext of "admiring" (ᾔνουν) the workmanship of the garments, their hands freely roam his person, and the women soon find a way to relieve Polymestor of his weapons. He is now trapped in a web of their devising. Caught by his own pride in his appearance, he might only then have remembered that Trojan women are equally renowned for *their* weaving skills! Mayhem soon follows. The women, led by Hecuba, draw daggers from beneath their lovely robes to kill the boys and then use brooches, like those which held the dresses of the Phrygian slave girls kneeling before Clytemnestra, to blind the king. What is left unsaid is that Trojan women judging the handiwork of other weavers would not, in itself, engender suspicion. Polymester seems not to have been surprised at the women's response to his clothes; if he had been, he might have had to time to remove himself from their quarters before they could enact Hecuba's revenge.

---

[156] Zophia H. Archibald, *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace. Orpheus Unmasked* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 148–149, emphasizes the importance of textiles among the Thracians, adding that it is "archaeologically quite well attested."

Once again, ostentatious submission to the pleasures of luxurious woven accouterments becomes, in Euripides' hands, a metaphor for "softened," and eventually compromised, character.

Weaving Metaphors

Ion, as we have seen throughout the chapter, is a play that is filled with references, allusions, and full-fledged descriptions of real weavings, less so, with metaphors associated with the craft. Hence, our efforts until this point have been to identify and explain the references and allusions to real life practices and artifacts. However, before we leave the subject of weaving and textiles in Euripides, it would be remiss not to discuss the metaphorical uses of this language. Metaphorical adaptations of the language associated with the art and craft of weaving are a familiar phenomenon in Greek literature; it is thus not necessarily remarkable that such figures are found in abundance in Euripides. The majority of the Euripidean occurrences fall into one or another category of common weaving metaphor and, as a result, are neither significant indicators of this poet's interest in artisanal language and visual imagery nor worthy of extended analysis. These would include, for example, *Rh.* 834, where the charioteer excoriates Hector for blaming the Trojan guards (the chorus) for allowing the murderer to get past them, accusing Hector of πλέκων λόγους, among other things, and *IT* 681, where the language of weaving is applied in typical generic fashion to conniving behavior (ῥάψαι μόρον).[157] Other examples of Euripides' application of the language of weaving for figurative or metaphorical effects, however, are less routine and more inventive, and revelatory of a playwright who, as we have come to know, is concerned with technical accuracy.

One conspicuous example is Euripides' fondness for the verb κατα-ξαίνω, whose primary meaning is "comb or card wool," in its various figurative or metaphorical senses, including both active and passive forms, to mean "rend, waste, wear away, mangle, lacerate," and so forth. Wool is prepared for spinning by removing impurities by "carding" or combing with a brush, which also serves to straighten and separate the fibers. The process is described at length, and with a dose of humor, by one of the women who are in the habit of doing it as part of their daily routine, Lysistrata, in the eponymous play by Aristophanes (*Lys.* 574–586). For

[157] For the latter, cf. *Od.* 8. 578–580, where it is the gods who "spin fate" for mortals.

the different purposes of the tragedian, it is easy to see how the term, καταξαίνω, and the process behind it offered a powerful visual analogy with what can happen to the human body under stressful conditions, both physical and mental.[158] Thus, the nurse at *Hipp.* 274 uses it to refer to the body of her mistress, Phaedra, who is wasting away with an inexplicable, guilt-ridden love for her stepson. Megara (*HF* 285) characterizes those who spend their lives enduring mockery by their enemies as πυρὶ καταξανθέντας, something she regards as a fate worse than death; Bond translates "reduced," "wasted," sensibly explaining that "fire wastes the body as carding reduces the bulk of wool."[159] Medea (*Med.* 1030) uses the verb to underscore the hard price that childbearing and rearing have exacted from her body, in an effort to prepare herself psychologically for the acts of infanticide she has determined to commit; under entirely different circumstances, identical language is used by Andromache in her last address to her son at *Tr.* 760. Ion (*Ion* 1267) uses the term with great effect to help his audience picture what the rocks will do to Creusa's hair after she is hurled from Mt. Parnassus in punishment for having plotted his death. Rocks have done or will do similar things to people's bodies at *Supp.* 503 and *Tr.* 509; likewise, military weapons at *Ph.* 1145. Another word for carding wool, κατακνάπτω, is a *hapax* at *Tr.* 1253. Called by Barlow a "strong compound," it describes what Hecuba has made of her once grand hopes for her life; both Barlow and Lee translate, appropriately, "mangle."[160] On the other hand, Biehl's "zerronnen sind," is too weak;[161] the fact that the verb is a *hapax* suggests that we should find ways to translate that reflect the uniqueness and specificity of Euripides' choice.

Another technical term associated with weaving, τολυπεύω ("wind off carded wool into a ball for spinning"), is used with great originality at *Rh.* 743–744. Rhesus' charioteer is looking for Hector in order to inform him

---

[158] Page, *Euripides Medea*, p. 147, in his discussion of the term's occurrence at *Med.* 1030, describes the carding process in great detail, citing ancient sources. He also notes, again citing ancient sources, that the same instrument used to card, called a κνάφος ("teazle"), was in fact used for actual torture: "As an instrument of torture it was a sort of sharp-toothed harrow over which the body was dragged, lacerating the flesh and causing profuse bleeding." According to Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 243 (ad loc. *Supp.* 503), "it [καταξαίνω] describes any unnatural suffering," including emaciation, burning, and stoning.

[159] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 135; Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 136, suggests "harrowed," "scourged."

[160] Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, p. 226; Lee, *Euripides Troades*, pp. 273–274.

[161] Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 438.

and the other Trojans of the murder of the Thracian king. According to the distraught bearer of the news, the as yet unidentified perpetrator has vanished, but not before "having worked up an open wound for the Thracians" (φανερὸν / Θρῃξὶν πένθος τολυπεύσας). W.H. Porter is mistaken when he observes that this verb appears "here only after Homer," but it is by no means common.[162] While it would be as easy to translate, with metaphorical sense, "achieved, accomplished, or worked," only the last, I think, preserves enough of the craft origins of the term to do justice to the boldness of the image. But the intended effect of the metaphor is less obvious. Perhaps Euripides was thinking of the tension behind the wound wool, or of the chaos that would ensue should it prematurely unravel. Similar claims could be made for Euripides' use of ποικίλλω as a craft-based metaphor[163] whose primary meaning is "work in various colors, inweave," not necessarily in a flattering sense, at *Cyc.* 339.[164] The Cyclops, ridiculing men who make laws for themselves, describes the activities of such men as, literally, "inweaving human life with colors" (ποικίλλοντες ἀνθρώπων βίον). As the remark is intended to be humorous, the metaphorical sense should probably be either "complicating" or, more likely, "embellishing;" more freely interpreted, the sentiment might be something like "making their mortal little lives seem more important than they are."

Barlow draws attention to the richness of metaphorical language involving weaving in *Andromache*, specifically pointing to the frequent occurrences of ῥάπτω and πλέκω (vv. 66, 911, 995) and the compound μηχανορράφος (vv. 447, 1116), in a metaphorical sense, as well as μηχανο-based words (vv. 85, 549, 770, 983), sometimes directly in conjunction with the weaving language (vv. 66, 995). She explains that the repetition of a certain image must be deliberate when it underlines "a central dramatic idea;" in the case of *Andromache* "the metaphor of stitching or weaving plots underlines the theme of vicious intrigue" in the play.[165] At *Or.* 12–13 Electra speaks of the enmity between the brothers Atreus and Thyestes with multiple weaving metaphors (στέμματα

[162] Porter, *The Rhesus of Euripides*, p. 80; presumably he is thinking only of metaphorical uses of the term; the occurrence at Ar. *Lys.* 587 is literal rather than metaphorical. The compound ἐκτολυπεύω ("to unravel"), also found at Hes. *Sc.* 44, is used metaphorically at A. *Ag.* 1032. For the verb's rarity, cf. LSJ, *TLG*, s. v.

[163] Cf. Scheid and Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus*, p. 118, with n. 26.

[164] A slight modification of LSJ, s. v. i. 1, since "work in embroidery" cannot stand, as Wace, "Weaving or Embroidery?," pp. 54–55, with n. 26, demonstrates.

[165] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 106, with n. 48.

ξήνασ' ἐπέκλωσεν θεὰ / Ἔρις). We should recall that the strife between the brothers was one of two subjects actually woven by Iphigenia that were mentioned as tokens in the recognition scene in *IT* (vv. 811–817). The expression καλοὺς κακοὺς / λόγους ἑλίσσων ("spinning out words that are both good and bad") used of Talthybius' "two-pronged" (διχόμυθα, v. 890) speech at *Or.* 891–892 probably should be taken, with Willink, as a variation on the metaphor of either weaving or spinning in the pejorative sense.[166] The Phrygian slave, in his disjointed account of events later in the same play (vv. 1431–1436), himself effectively "spins" out a technically lucid[167] description of Helen weaving a purple linen garment for the tomb of her sister, Clytemnestra, in a lyric passage whose frenetic rhythms are a match for the whirling fingers (δακτύλοις ἕλισσεν) it describes. Aristophanes has Aeschylus parody this passage in a wonderful pastiche of Euripidean weaving tropes at *Ra.* 1314–1316: εἱειειειλίσσετε δακτύλοις φάλαγγες / ἱστόπονα πηνίσματα, / κερκίδος ἀοιδοῦ μελέτας ("You, spiders, wind weavings with your fingers, toils of the loom, efforts of the singing shuttle").[168] With one stroke Aristophanes manages to poke fun at Euripides' fascination with banausic activities *and* his preoccupation with women and womanly pursuits; both happen to be embodied in the craft presided over by the patron goddess of their native city.

Conclusion

Our analysis of the language of weaving in Euripides has ultimately led us far afield from where we started, but we have not wandered idly. The plot of *Ion* happens to offer a unique milieu in which the triple themes of weaving, women, and the city of Athens may be intertwined in a coherent mythos. While metaphors and other figurative language associated with weaving are not uncommon in Greek literature from all periods and places, the craft's bond with historical Athens is especially close because of Athena's patronage of the city, making the references and allusions to it in Attic poetry somehow more significant. This is the deity who appears at the end of Euripides' drama in lieu of the *deus non gratus* of the play,

[166] Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 229, who compares *Andr.* 448, *Tr.* 200, *Or.* 1431–1433; cf. West, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 245.
[167] As explained by Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 317.
[168] Cf. *Ra.* 1348.

Apollo, whose most sacred sanctuary has furnished the imaginations of the fifth-century audience with a spectacular natural backdrop for the duration of the action, and whose temple has served as the primary topographical feature standing in for the site. Yet, as we have seen, *Ion* is a play whose heart nonetheless beats far away in the less naturally sublime scenic environment of Athens, where the beauty of nature had long been supplanted by a large and diverse body of manmade monuments, housing the civic and religious institutions for which the city was famed, some lost to the Persians, others relatively new, on which the ancient Greek world's most acclaimed artistic legacy was best displayed. These monuments, as I have tried to show, are evoked throughout the play, layered into the text in both subtle and overt ways.

Euripides and his audience traced their lineage to this odd little man, Ion. They may trace their weaving preoccupation to him, too, for the woven coverlet of youthful workmanship in the Pythia's basket which serves as a token of proof of his royal and divine heredity may in fact be a prototype for the far grander Panathenaic peplos, another piece of figured loomwork, also produced by maidens, with an impeccable pedigree. Anyone who is in doubt about how central the symbolism of that square of cloth was for the city of Athens may be reminded that, from the late fifth-century on (e.g., Ar. *Eq*. 566, 1180; *Av*. 827) and probably earlier, at the mere mention of the word "peplos," most Athenians would have understood that the Panathenaic garment was meant.[169] To further underscore its centrality to Athenian self-identity, during the procession that was the highlight of the Greater Panathenaia, the quadrennial festival in honor of Athena's birthday (a celebration of civic pride which has no parallel in antiquity), this textile was displayed as a sail on a float that took the form of a ship, symbol of a hegemony that, at the time of *Ion*'s production, was, as it happens, soon to be severely compromised by the failed Sicilian expedition. The fact that both "loom" and "mast" were designated in Greek by the same term, ἱστός, suggests that a linguistic and semiotic correspondence lies, at least in part, behind this quaint and otherwise inexplicable custom.[170] It follows that any literary or dramatic reference to the artistry of fine weaving is likely to have brought

[169] Blaise Nagy, "The Peplotheke: What Was It?," in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on His Eightieth Birthday* (Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monograph) 10, ed. Kent J. Rigsby, (Durham, NC, 1984), 227–232 (229–230); this is especially evident in Attic inscriptions, where, as Nagy demonstrates, the word "peplos" can *only* mean the Panathenaic robe.

[170] Cf. Scheid and Svenbro, *The Craft of Zeus*, p. 20.

to the typical Athenian's mind not foreign, but homespun goods: *the* peplos, inwoven with a version of the story of the Gigantomachy which foregrounded the ἀριστεία of the warrior goddess,[171] their goddess, an emblem of Athens' ship of state.

[171] Gigantomachies typically featured a scene with Athena fighting Enkelados, as at *Ion* 209–210, or less frequently, another giant; see *LIMC* 3, pt. 1, s. v. "Enkelados," pp. 742–743 (F. Vian); 4, pt. 1, s. v. "Gigantes," pp. 255–256 (F. Vian with M.B. Moore).

CHAPTER FIVE

A PRACTICED HAND

Introduction

Thus far we have witnessed Euripides on occasion after occasion delving deeply into the technical vocabulary, both generic and specialized, associated with the major visual art media of his day: architecture, sculpture, painting, and weaving. We have again and again observed evidence of the playwright's awareness of actual, or plausibly actual, monuments and artifacts of his own day and earlier and how he incorporated his keen eye for visual culture effectively and seamlessly into the contexts of his plays. Perhaps most impressive have been those instances examined above in which Euripides demonstrates an awareness of the sometimes mundane, sometimes arcane, and at times profound issues and intricacies particular to each individual medium—a conversancy with "shop talk," if you will—strongly suggestive of a layman's intimate acquaintance with the materials and methods of the various art practices. While Socrates might not have approved of such dilettantism in the matter of *technai*, contemporary audiences took note, if only for the purposes of ridicule or parody. In this he offered himself up as prime fodder for old comedians, who evidently could not resist spoofing the playwright for this tendency. This final chapter is devoted to the ways in which Euripides was engaged more broadly with the very idea of art and artistry, craft and craftsmanship, as variously manifested in the world in which he lived and plied his own craft. Given the extreme likelihood that Euripides views reflect and respond to the views of his time period (why would they not?), so the process of gleaning his extant works holds out the reward of nuggets of invaluable primary evidence for contemporary perceptions of the artist, the production of the artifact, and the creative act, itself.

Once again, we need look no further than his language for demonstration. Some of this language is metaphorical or at least figurative in nature, and as such not necessarily exceptional or unusual, if more frequent, for appearing in Euripides; consequently, we will spend little time with it. However, because these words turn up in Euripides, whose

fondness for artisanal-based language I hope to have made clear, they merit notice. A quick review of the more prominent examples, mostly verbs, that arguably still preserve a craft-based undertone will illustrate the point.

When Hippolytus, with rising apprehension, hears his father, Theseus, who has just discovered his dead wife, making overly refined observations about the foibles of human nature, he chooses a craftsman's term, λεπτουργέω ("to do fine work"), to characterize Theseus' manner of speech (*Hipp.* 923). In his commentary Halleran notes that the verb "is used primarily of artisans," and that it appears, with metaphorical sense, "uniquely here in tragedy."[1] The verb μαλάσσω, used of softening leather or metal (LSJ, s. v. i, 1–2), is used figuratively for "to soften, appease" three times in *Alcestis* (381, 771, 1085), as well as at *Or.* 1201. A verb whose craft undertones are more forcefully retained even in its figurative or metaphorical senses is τεύχω ("to produce by work or art, to make, build," LSJ, s. v. i). It is a striking verb choice, beginning with its earliest occurrence at *Il.* 1. 4. Euripides uses it of strife at *Andr.* 644, of fortune at *Heracl.* 614 and, more literally, of the building of a temple at *IT* 1453 and of a grave at *Rh.* 959. (The unquestionably literal occurrences, I would argue, render it more likely that some of the original craft sense is preserved in the metaphorical appearances of the term.) The verb τεκταίνομαι ("to do joiners' work, to frame, devise, plan, contrive") is used figuratively at *IT* 951, where Orestes speaks of his enforced (ἐτεκτήναντ' ἀπρόσφθεγκτόν μ') isolation at Athens during his trial. Kyriakou calls our attention to this "unusual periphrasis, with a concentration of harsh consonants." She is careful to preserve the crafts origins of the term in her interpretation: "The choice of the rare verb τεκταίνομαι brings out the artificiality of the arrangement: the unaddressed, isolated Orestes is a 'construct' of the hosts, 'put together' by them as if they were clever τέκτονες."[2]

Another common verb that yet retains a foothold in the world of the artisan is ἀσκέω ("work raw materials, form by art, smooth," LSJ, s. v. i, 1). I mention two examples where it appears to retain its artisinal inflection. Hecuba accuses Helen of coming out "after having polished up your figure" (σὸν δέμας … ἀσκήσασα) at *Tr.* 1022–1023.[3] The tone

[1] Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 228.

[2] Kyriakou, *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, pp. 309–310.

[3] For the derogatory overtones of the use of the verb, cf. Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 241; Biehl's, *Euripides Troades*, p. 373, "ἀσκεῖν = κοσμεῖν," which he applies here and elsewhere in E., is, I think it fair to say, overly reductive and strips the image of its particular coloring.

is again derogatory when it is used of Helen's sister, Clytemnestra, at *El.* 1072–1073, where Electra berates her mother for primping while her husband is away (γυνὴ δ' ἀπόντος ἀνδρὸς ἥτις ἐκ δόμων / ἐς κάλλος ἀσκεῖ, διάγραφ' ὡς οὖσαν κακήν, "The woman who, when her husband is away from home, polishes and buffs for the purpose of beauty, write her off as base").[4] Forms of ἀραρίσκω ("to fit, join together"), too frequent to enumerate, and some examples of which have been addressed above, might also be added to the list. A verb more exclusively associated with the plastic arts, πλάσσω ("to mold, form"), occurs on a couple of occasions.[5] The *eidôlon* of Helen is "fashioned" (πλάσαντος) at *Hel.* 585. In adjectival form it is used as a synonym for "fake" at *Ba.* 218 (πλασταῖσι βακχείαισιν)—similar to the way in which "plastic" can be used today—attesting, by the way, to the common, and justified, ancient attitude of wariness towards the artist's ability to counterfeit nature.[6] A prominent example of Euripides' use of συντήκω ("to melt down, fuse together, weld") and its variants occurs at fr. 296. 2 (*Bell.*), where it has a figurative sense of one bad man happily "blending" with another. From the same play, fr. 298. 1 has the apparent *hapax* ἐγξέσῃ ("plane, whittle," according to Collard; "scratch, scrape, shred in," according the LSJ).[7] Apollo advises Menelaus to ease his "whetted" (τεθηγμένον) disposition (*Or.* 1625) or, in Kovacs' translation, "blunt the keen edge of your heart's anger!"[8]

A few examples of idiosyncratic craft-based language choices aside from verbs should briefly be noted. Euripides was fond of words ending in some form of -ηλατος ("beaten," from ἐλαύνω, LSJ, s. v. iii, 1). Examples include declensions of θεηλάτος and θεηλάτον at *Ion* 1306, 1392, and *Andr.* 851, used roughly to mean "divine" or "divinely made"; of χρυσηλάτος at *Andr.* 166–167, used literally of beaten gold vessels, and at *Ion*

[4] Diggle, *Studies*, pp. 40–41, is troubled by the use of ἀσκέω "in a reflexive sense" and suggests that perhaps a line has been lost "in which ἀσκεῖ was given its object." Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 173, however, sees no difficulty.

[5] Since both Diggle and Lee, *Euripides Troades*, bracket the lines in which the verb appears at *Ion* 830, I do not include the passage.

[6] On Xenophanes' use of *plasmata* to refer to "fabrications," both verbal and visual, see Ford, *The Origins of Criticism*, pp. 57–58 and 98.

[7] Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 117, while cautioning: "Text and translation are insecure"; cf. Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7, whose spelling of the verb, following a conjecture by Heath, I adopt, as does N^2. Kannicht (*TrGF* 5) prefers ἐγξύσῃ, apparently the aorist, following Matthiae (Stob., according to Collard). That the Euripidean favorite ξεστός (see below) appears at fr. 305.1 (*Bell.*) may lend support to the present reading.

[8] The metaphor is not unique to E.; θήγω is used of λόγοι at A. *Pr.* 311; in a reflexive sense of Eteocles at A. *Th.* 715; of a γλῶσσα at S. *Aj.* 584 (cf. the "forging" [χαλκεύω] of the tongue at Pi. *P.* 1. 86); of the formation of character at Pi. *O.* 10. 20.

25, of beaten gold snakes (i.e., a bracelet). Hephaistos' role as divine metalworker is subtly acknowledged in a wonderful epithet which, according to Willink, occurs only at *Or.* 621: ἀνηφαίστῳ πυρί ("with an unhephaistian fire") effectively conveys the notion that the fire that Electra has ignited under the house of Atreus is metaphorical and not real, at least for the time being.[9] Into this category also fall images like "a fire-born hand" (πυριγενεῖ παλάμᾳ, *Or.* 820), an effective way to refer to a hand-forged sword, the hand that wielded it, and the violence of the act of matricide, all at once.[10] Odysseus is a "piece of work" (κρότημα), specifically, a product of hammering, at *Rh.* 499, a characterization which most would agree is apt. The καρκίνος ("pincers") that will metaphorically grasp the neck of the guest-consuming Cyclops at *Cy.* 608–610 might also be mentioned; as the stake to the eye that he is soon to get is enough to do him in, we should not think of an additional form of torture.[11] Even this brief overview should make clear that, whenever he had the option of a craft-based term, as opposed to a more colorless, abstract one, to convey his intended subtleties of meaning, Euripides frequently preferred the former.

In the Studio

The bulk of the language of concern to us in the present chapter, however, gives the impression of having been imported directly from the real-life milieu of the artisanat, absent the cover of metaphor. Much of this vocabulary and imagery preserves the aura of the workshop or studio; some seems even to emanate from a lost technical artisan's manual. When, for instance, at fr. 724 (*Tel.*) (Austin fr. 132) the cure for Telephus' wound is described as πριστοῖσι λόγχης ῥινήμασιν ("filings shaved from the spear"), a detail that has been considered an innovation of the tragedian's,[12] we wonder whether Euripides' has witnessed the cold-chasing

---

[9] Cf. West, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 225; Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 185; at *Or.* 1618 the threat of fire becomes real, although it is not carried out.

[10] Cf. Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, p. 218.

[11] Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 39, regards this as a reference to the vise-like grip in which he is to be held by one of Odysseus' men as the stake is driven into the eye; if so, the use is still metaphorical.

[12] Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 51 (cf. Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 8, p. 211), pointing to M.T. Ditifeci, "Note al Telefo di Euripide," *Prometheus* 10 (1984), 210–220; rust or the point of the spear constituted the cure elsewhere, though there is understandable ambiguity in both the primary and secondary literature on the distinction between

of an actual spearhead. Since we know from the plot of *Thesmophoriazousae* that Aristophanes paid special attention to Euripides' *Telephus*, the line might very well have prompted the announcement by the chorus at *Ra.* 901–902, anticipating the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides, that they expect the younger playwright "to say something urbane and keenly filed (κατερρινημένον)," and leads naturally to the suspicion that, of the two classes of words assigned to the two poets at *Ra.* 881, ῥή<γ>ματα ("chunks") and παραπρίσματα ("saw-shavings"), the latter belong to Euripides.[13] Cropp draws attention to an apparently famous painting that depicted this version of Telephus' healing, likely by Parrhasios, to infer from Pliny's comments on three occasions (*NH* 25. 42; 34. 152 [decutiens is the verb]; 35. 71), and suspects that it may have reflected Euripides' play.[14] Claudia Preiser cautiously agrees, while acknowledging that the motif could just as well be owed to an earlier painting, and proposes a trajectory that leads from the innovator, Euripides, through the mediation of Parrhasios' painted version, down to the rust cure of Apollodorus (*Epit.* 3. 20). One of her observations is particularly intriguing: "Denkbar ist, daß er die Abschabsel farbig abgesetzt und so die Deutung als Grünspan nahegelegt hat."[15] Given such originality, I wonder whether the influence went in the reverse direction, from Parrhasios' painting to the playwright. However, I would not want to press the point; Euripides' ῥινήματα imply metal filings rather than rust or verdigris, which is what was depicted in the painting, based upon Pliny's commentary, as small, but significant detail. For our purposes, the term alone is symptomatic of the playwright's affinity for workshop-sounding language. The use of ῥινήματα, as Preiser puts it, "ist eine für Euripides bezeichnende fachwissenschaftliche Einzelheit."[16]

Another prominent example of this category of language is presented by Euripides' attention to the niceties of the craft of joinery. A technical term for "joint," or "join," of masonry, metal, or wood, ἁρμός, is known

---

rust, verdigris, and metal filings. Claudia Preiser, "Achilleus' Heilmittel für Telephos in den *Kyprien*, in Euripides' *Telephos*, bei Plinius und bei Apollodor," *Rheinisches Museum* 144 (2001), 277–286, with appropriate references, primary and secondary, reviews all of the evidence and reaches a similar conclusion.

[13] Cf. Dover, *Aristophanes Frogs*, p. 302. I print the text of Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes. Frogs, Assemblywomen, Wealth* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2002), who prefers ῥήγματα, a conjecture attributed variously by editors and commentators, to the oddly uninflected ῥήματα of the mss.

[14] Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 51 (cf. Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 8, p. 211).

[15] Preiser, "Achilleus' Heilmittel für Telephos," p. 281.

[16] Preiser, "Achilleus' Heilmittel für Telephos," p. 279.

mostly from inscriptions and Euripides.[17] Fr. 472. 8 (*Cret.*) (Austin fr. 79) contains a precise description of the roof of a temple, whose wooden ceiling beams were composed of planks of indigenous Cretan cypress wood laminated together (ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμούς) with ox-glue. As Collard and Cropp observe: "This remarkable fragment is densely allusive," and note with evident admiration that "Euripides describes skilled carpentry."[18] Similarly Euripides bothers to note that the chariot in which Hippolytus is driven to his death is also "tightly glued and closely joined" (κολλητῶν, *Hipp.* 1225). This last is a Homeric term, as Halleran observes, but tellingly appears "nowhere else in tragedy."[19] Barrett considers it "a purely ornamental epithet" borrowed from epic, where "it presumably indicates strength of construction."[20] However, the same might be said of all Homeric words in Greek literature,[21] on the assumption that these terms have no meaning in their present context; it seems unwise to do so. A. Trevor Hodge, while noting that κολλάω "can be used metaphorically," rightly concludes that "its frequent appearance in inscriptions along with items recording the purchase of actual glue" attests to its technical application.[22]

We encounter ἁρμός again in fr. 360. 12 (*Erec.*) in a simile borrowed from joinery to characterize the status of a person who moves his residence from one city to another: ἁρμὸς πονηρὸς ὥσπερ ἐν ξύλῳ παγείς ("just like a bad join having been made in wood") that, in so many words, keeps coming apart at the seams. Cropp translates: "like a peg ill-fitted in a piece of wood."[23] However, as tempting as it may be to draw an analogy with some version of our own proverbial expression "round peg in

---

[17] LSJ, s. v. Inscriptions in which the term is found in its technical sense include *IG* II^2 1666 A and B, passim, and 1675. 4, 5, both concerning a fourth-century portico at Eleusis; *IG* VII 3073. 116, 122, 142, 152, 161, a Hellenistic building contract from Lebadeia; *IG* II^2 463. 40, which concerns a late fourth-century wall between Athens and the Piraeus. The term appears at S. *Ant.* 1216; it does not occur in A.

[18] Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7, pp. 537 and 539; for additional commentary, see also Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, pp. 68–69, with references. Meiggs, *Trees and Timber*, pp. 197–198, with fig. 7, a cross-section diagram of the roof of the Parthenon, is particularly useful on the component wooden parts of a temple roof. On the use of glue, and possibly nails, in the lamination process, see Hodge, *The Woodwork of Greek Roofs*, pp. 97 and 126, who nonetheless admits: "We know little about how the timbers were joined to each other."

[19] Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 253.

[20] Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 387.

[21] Cf. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytus*, ad loc. v. 1223, in reference to πυριγενῆ.

[22] Hodge, *The Woodwork of Greek Roofs*, p. 126, with epigraphical references.

[23] In Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 159.

a square hole," my rendition attempts to preserve, I think appropriately, the concept of joinery inherent in ἁρμός. At fr. 781. 254 (*Pha.*), the same term refers either to the place where the two leaves of a door meet or to the carpentered joints of the leaves themselves.[24] The former is more likely, since smoke is issuing through the join. At both *Med.* 1315 and *Hipp.* 809 a first glimpse at dead bodies (Jason's and Medea's children and Phaedra, respectively) is anticipated as the door is opened and the space between the two leaves is widened (ἐκλύεθ' ἁρμούς, in both instances). Commentators suggest that, in both passages, the "fastening" of the door is meant, rather than the "joint between them"; however, again I prefer an interpretation that preserves the key image of joinery.[25]

Another favorite of Euripides is the adjective ξεστός, meaning "hewn" or "polished," usually in reference to stone or wood, but other materials may also evince this characteristic sign of fine finishing or heavy use. While the term is a favorite of Homer's, it is not found in Aeschylus or Sophocles.[26] It has already been introduced in our discussion of the hypallage ξεστὸν λόχον at *Tr.* 534, which, as we have seen, refers simultaneously to the recently finished Trojan horse and its hidden band of warriors. Additional occurrences may now be reviewed in brief. The epithet qualifies and ennobles objects ranging from the incidental to the monumental: Wooden roasting spits at *Cy.* 394 have ends that have been burnt to a point while the remainder has been worked smooth (ξεστούς) with a sickle, while, at the opposite extreme, the ξεστὸν ὄχθον Δαναϊδῶν ἑδρασμάτων in fr. 305. 1 (*Bell.*) likely alludes to a major structure of hewn and dressed stone, perhaps a tribunal at Argos at which a trial is being held.[27] Tombs are often "polished" in Euripides (as in Homer), as if to bespeak both the careful labor that went into their construction and the

---

[24] Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, p. 163, prefers the former, as do Collard and Cropp in their translation in *Euripides*, 8, while Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 237, allows that both are possible.

[25] Mastronarde, *Euripides Medea*, p. 376; Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 317; Halleran, *Euripides Hippolytus*, p. 218.

[26] It is used of wooden objects at *Od.* 4. 272, 12. 172, 14. 350, 17. 93, 18. 33; of stone objects at *Od.* 3. 406; *Il.* 6. 243 and 244, 18. 504; of horn at *Od.* 19. 566. Regarding its absence in A. and S., cf. Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 72. ἄξεστος does occur at S. *OC* 19 and fr. 322 (*TrGF* 4).

[27] On the difficulty of locating a trial in E.'s *Bell.*, see Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, pp. 111 and 119, who cautions that the fragment may not even belong to this play; others have put it with *Sthenoboea*. Collard, op. cit., p. 119, also points out that a scholiastic note to *Or.* 872 quotes this fragment "to illustrate a high tribunal (871) postulated in Argos." It seems clear that the reference is to a built structure of some sort.

finality of the deaths that they honor; polishing is, after all, the finishing touch. The term is used to describe Alcestis' tomb at *Alc.* 836, at the risk of implying that a stone monument has already been erected over her grave, and, at *Hel.* 986, that of King Proteus, upon which Menelaus threatens that he and his wife will lie together as corpses, a sentiment voiced by Admetus, as well. Clymene in *Phaethon* (fr. 781. 222) suggests placing the body of the fallen youth in the ξεστοῖσι θαλάμοις in which her husband Merops keeps his gold, since she alone possesses a seal which permits entrance and exit through the chamber's doors without detection. Collard suggests that the adjective alludes to the splendor of the palace of Merops; however, I suspect that it is a proleptic reference to Phaethon's grave.[28]

At *Or.* 1387–1388 Helen is the Erinye of the "polished" (ξεστῶν) Apollonian towers (περγάμων) of Troy. The epithet is used again of a tower of hewn and dressed stone at *Tr.* 46, of the rungs of a ladder burnished from use at *Ph.* 1179, and, rather more atypically, of the streets of Thebes at *HF* 782. The last has puzzled some commentators, including Bond, who finds difficulty with the image of "polished" or "hewn" streets when applied to Thebes: "Thebes is a muddy place, and even now the lanes connecting houses in Greece are rough; they certainly were not paved or polished in Euripides' time."[29] Yet, even if the archaeological authenticity of the image is not as easy to corroborate as we might wish, it is nevertheless easy to imagine that, with time and use, the surface of even a mud-and-gravel based "pavement" would acquire a fine burnish that would merit the epithet. In fr. 588a (*Palam.*), a parody by Aristophanes of an incident from Euripides' lost *Palamedes* (*Thesm.* 778), we find the kinsman scratching a message of his plight on πινάκων ξεστῶν δέλτοι ("tablets of polished wood"), a periphrasis for the oar blades of the original play (*Thesm.* 769–771), which likely were described with similar language. (In fr. 578 of Euripides' play, Palamedes claims to have invented writing.)

---

28 In Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 233; Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, p. 145, compares *Il.* 6.243 ff.

29 Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 272–273; cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 176–177. Bond, loc. cit., offers an alternative reading that would have ξεστᾶς applying to πόλεως and ἑπτάπυλοι to ἀγυιαί. Nor was stone paving known in fifth-century Athens; the most familiar example, the hewn blocks which pave the section of the Panathenaic way between the agora and the acropolis which can still be seen today, wheel-ruts (probably from the Panathenaic ship-cart) and all, date from the first or second centuries CE (Thompson and Wycherley, *Agora* 14, pp. 193 and pl. 99). John Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London, 1971), p. 422, does not date the section of hewn blocks, but observes that "the road has a very hard pebble surfacing."

Finally, the *agalma* of Artemis is ξεστόν at *IT* 111–112, which, since we also know it to be portable, able to be passed through an aperture in the Doric frieze of the temple, and carried by Iphigenia (*IT* 1157–1158), confirms that it is an under-life-size, ancient wooden image like that of Athena from the acropolis of Athens rather than a marble statue.[30] In this case the epithet serves as an indicator of the object's great age and sacredness. Indeed, fourth-century vase-paintings that illustrate scenes from *IT* feature the statue in various period styles, resulting, naturally, from an overlay of contemporary style onto a vaguely archaizing format, but the scale is always small, about half life-size, to reflect its portability.[31] Such vases are less useful for deducing the medium of the statue. However, one example (Hermitage B 2080), somewhat more realistic than the others, shows Orestes, Iphigenia, and Pylades in flight; although it is difficult to make out from an illustration, the tiny statue that Iphigenia carries under her arm is noticeably primitive-looking, as de Cesare, who has collected this material, recognizes; moreover, its coloration, as best as I can ascertain, could indicate wood.[32]

In another image borrowed from the artisan's milieu, Electra, lamenting the state of her physical appearance before the stranger who had yet to reveal himself as her brother, draws attention to the filth on her once pampered body in the following way: πίνῳ ϑ᾽ ὅσῳ βέβριϑ᾽ ("I am laden with so much grime," *El.* 305). The unexpected term πίνος gives Electra's forthright admission its distinctive cast. According to Rahim A. Raman, it is "a rare word of obscure origin" that became at some point a term for "surface-deposit" on a bronze statue, whether "verdigris" (the undesirable green tinge that disfigures bronze statues exposed to salt air or water) or "patina" (the desirable evidence of aging) (cf. LSJ, s. v. i, 2).[33] The former sense is found in Plutarch (*Mor.* 395b; cf. 820f.), in a lengthy

---

[30] Of ξεστόν at *IT* 111, cf. Kyriakou, *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 79: "the first explicit indication that the statue is a *xoanon*."

[31] Cf. Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 180. De Cesare, *Le statue in imagine*, fig. 49 (Nat. Arch. Mus. Ferrara 3032), fig. 50 (Pushkin Mus. Moscow 504), fig. 82 (priv. coll.), fig. 83 (Nat. Arch. Mus. Matera 12061). Vase-paintings that show the theft of the Palladium are also instructive (e.g., de Cesare, op. cit., fig. 89 [Nat. Arch. Mus. Naples 3231] and fig. 90 [Nat. Arch. Mus. Taranto]); on the theme, see also Oenbrink, *Das Bild im Bilde*, pp. 65–72, with illustr.

[32] De Cesare, *Le statue in imagine*, fig. 93 and pp. 153–154; cf. Oenbrink, *Das Bild im Bilde*, pp. 100–116, with illustr.

[33] Rahim A. Raman, "Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος. A Semantic Problem," *Glotta* 53 (1975), 195–207 (202–203); cf. Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots* (Paris, 1968), s. v.

digression on statues in the open air at Delphi that is noteworthy for its display of technical expertise. There the author distinguishes πίνος from *both* "patina" (ἀνθηρόν) and "rust" (ἰός), suggesting that by Plutarch's time it had become a conventional term for a particular kind of corrosion to which statues were susceptible when exposed to the elements over a period of time. Drawing on the technical senses of the term, in the first century BC, Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses πίνος metaphorically of the burnished aura, hence "patina," of an archaistic style of composition (*Dem.* 5 and 39; cf. ἀρχαιοπινής, "bloom of antiquity," in 38) or of a kind of mellow pearliness that characterizes a "beautiful" (καλός) literary style (*Comp.* 11). The word being as rare as it is, exactly when it acquired the narrower sense in which Plutarch understands it or if Euripides were aware of it when he chose his striking language, must remain open questions.

Some might argue that πίνος at *El.* 305 implies no image at all, that it connotes only generic dirt or grime, with no allusion to bronze statuary. According to Raman, who reviews the ancient sources in which the term appears, its first attested occurrence, at Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 776, is already metaphorical, presumably in the sense that it means simply "dirt"; he attributes the term's first appearance "in its literal sense," to a later play, Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* 1259, where "old dirt (πίνος) has settled on an old man (Oedipus)" (πίνος is Scaliger's correction of the mss. πόνος).[34] I am not so sure of the difference. The latter might be cited as a parallel for *El.* 305, "patina," but for the fact that a statue of an old man would be an anomaly in the later fifth century BC, making it less likely that an audience would be put in mind of such. "Old dirt," i.e., "patina," in a more metaphorical sense, much like Aeschylus, is probably what Sophocles intends. Raman does not mention the Euripidean passage. The very rarity of the word, however, argues against it as a major term for something as common as dirt; tragedy, in fact, had many other terms for the diverse phenomenon, κόνις being by far the preferred choice. Furthermore, different categories of dirt were given different names by the Greek poets, who were sensitive to the distinctions (as it was their business to be, and as it thus is ours). It makes sense that a singular category of "dirt," the sort that accrues to a statue over many years, would receive its own name, and that in cases in which the appearance of the human body mimics those conditions, that is, when a body has been untended over an

[34] Raman, "Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος," p. 202.

extended period of time, particular one in which the bloom of youth is still intact, it too acquires a visible "patina" that would be distinguishable from, for instance, a layer of dirt acquired during a day's work in the fields. In short there is nothing to hinder the assumption that πίνος, "dirt," had an integral connection with statues from the beginning, and that Euripides is, alone among the three tragedians, exploiting this aspect of the term. Thus, while Electra is not directly comparing her present self to a bronze statue (she has lost her beauty), in her use of the term, she calls attention to an accumulation of unwonted surface accretions that threatens to spoil the appearance of the statue she might have resembled in the past.[35]

In a famous two-part simile in Euripides' *Bacchae*, technical artisinal language of an impressively specific nature is employed as a device to help the audience to visualize a crucial scene, one of the most memorable in all of Greek tragedy, as reported by a messenger. As Dionysos, still in the guise of the Stranger, draws the tip of a fir tree down, down, down to ground level as a perch for Pentheus who, after a ride to the sky, obtains a better view of the activities of the Bacchantes, the divine action is described by way of a simile of two components: (1) a bow being strung and (2) a wheel in the process of being made: κυκλοῦτο δ' ὥστε τόξον ἢ κυρτὸς τροχὸς/τόρνῳ γραφόμενος περιφορὰν ἑλικοδρόμον (*Ba.* 1066–1067, to be translated presently).[36] The first part of the simile does not fall within the purview of the present study. Of great interest, however, is the second part, which has proved as intriguing to critics as it has been resistant to interpretation. While the subject of the simile is clear, how exactly to construe the complex phraseology in

---

[35] A better comparison would be a metaphor used of Paris, to a different end, at A. *Ag.* 390–393, which, though somewhat difficult to construe, seems to involve the undesirable version of "patina" on bronze; while there is no direct mention of a statue, and πίνος does not appear, since the physical person of the beautiful Paris is the stimulus for the image, a statue may fairly be inferred.

[36] The following discussion, with some revisions, repeats that of my "The Wheel Simile in *Bacchae*, Another Turn," *Mnemosyne* 59 (2006), 585–592. I adopt Diggle's text without alteration because it incorporates the combination of readings that I prefer; for a full consideration of the textual, grammatical, and metrical issues and difficulties associated with this passage, see James Diggle, "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069," *Eikasmos* 9 (1998), 41–52, as well as Robert Y. Tyrrell, *The Bacchae of Euripides with a Revision of the Text and a Commentary* (1892; repr. London, 1951), pp. 128–129; Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 210–211; Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 234–235; and, on Reiske's conjecture, ἑλικοδρόμον, B.J.J.M. Bongers, "Euripides *Bacchae* 1064–9: Dionysus, the Wheel and the Lathe," *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002), 83–87 (84 and passim), whose interpretation (see below) hinges in part on a preference for the ms. ἕλκει δρόμον.

which it is expressed is not. I propose that we are to imagine a length of damp, heated wood being bent over a convex mold or template (τόρνῳ, LSJ, s. v. iii) to form the felloe, or rim, of a spoked, as opposed to a solid, wheel, in a manner comparable to the forming of the staves of a barrel or of the body of a guitar or lute.[37] Alternatively, the *Bacchae* simile could refer to the act of bending a metal or leather tire over the wooden rim of a wheel, since the same principle is involved, that of manual pulling forward and into a circular form.[38] V. Gordon Childe illustrates a line drawing of a New Kingdom Theban tomb relief that shows wheelwrights at work, including one who is either pulling a felloe around a four-spoked wheel or attaching a tire to it.[39] The numerous wheels "bound" or "with borders (*termidwenta*)," some of metal, in the Linear B tablets at Knossos could refer either to felloes or tires.[40] The metal or leather used for tiring, however, unlike the wood of the felloe, would not incorporate the capability of springback that is inherent in the action described, making it the less likely alternative as a point of departure for the simile.

Rather, we might think either of a *single* felloe made out of one continuous strip of wood, or *multiple* felloes, being bent individually

---

[37] Based on my own personal experience of bending wood in a brief, but memorable, stint as an apprentice to a luthier, which inspired my interpretation of the *Ba.* simile in the first place; cf. William A. Keyser, Jr., "Steambending. Heat and Moisture Plasticize Wood," in *Fine Woodworking on Bending Wood. 35 Articles Selected by the Editors of Fine Woodworking Magazine* (Newton, CT, 1985), pp. 16–21. I assume that in antiquity the wood was similarly steam dampened beforehand; however, there is no ancient testimony for that aspect of the process, according to Colin Austin and S. Douglas Olson, *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford, 2004) p. 79, ad loc. Ar. *Th.* 53, to whom the following references are owed: For the heating of wood for bending, cf. *Od.* 21. 245–246; Thphr. *HP* 4. 11. 11; Theoc. 25. 249. Wheel-making (τροχοποιεῖν) is included in a list of respectable craft professions currently practiced by Athenian citizens at Ar. *Pl.* 513. For the use of curved molds in the process of bending wood, from a modern point of view, see Keyser, op. cit.

[38] On bending a metal tire for a modern (late nineteenth, early twentieth century) spoked, segment-felloed wheel, see George Sturt, *The Wheelwright's Shop* (1923; repr. Cambridge, Eng., 1993), p. 118; it required tremendous strength and dexterity "to bend the bar approximately into a complete circle, bringing one scarfed end fully round to meet the other"; according to Sturt, loc. cit., sometimes "the man would leap from the ground so as to get his whole weight into the pull." On ancient tires, see V. Gordon Childe, "Rotary Motion," in *A History of Technology*, 1, eds. Charles Singer, E.J. Holmyard, and A.R. Hall (Oxford, 1965), pp. 187–215 (208); E.M. Jope, "Vehicles and Harness," in *A History of Technology*, 2., eds. Charles Singer, E.J. Holmyard, A.R. Hall, and Trevor I. Williams (Oxford, 1956), pp. 537–562 (549) (Greek, specifically).

[39] "Rotary Motion," fig. 134.

[40] Chadwick, *The Mycenaean World*, p. 170, however, suspects "some decorative element."

against a mold and then fitted and bolted together to form the rim. Ancient evidence exists for both of these techniques.[41] A reference to a wheel made of two bent-wood felloes may be found, e.g., at Herodotus 4. 72. More complicated is the description at Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 426 (West): τρισπίθαμον δ' ἄψιν τάμνειν δεκαδώρῳ ἀμάξῃ ("cut a felloe[42] of three widths for a wagon with a width of ten-palms"). In interpreting the Hesiod passage, I regard πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα (*Op*. 427), despite editorial conventions of punctuation, as an internal accusative or an accusative in apposition to the (previous) sentence, either plural for singular, or, more likely, in recognition of the fact that there will be four of these, i.e., one per wheel.[43] T.A. Sinclair does the calculations, and concludes that ἄψις here refers to one quarter of the rim, which would then indicate a wheel composed of four felloes, the πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα of the next line.[44] On the other hand, M.L. West cannot accept a wheel composed of four felloes, on the basis that it is "not otherwise attested," and prefers to see a "primitive block-wheel," cut from a solid disc, measured across its diameter; consequently he seems rather at a loss to explain πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα: "now we learn of the utility of bent timbers," but is unwilling to see the phrase "as an additional object of τάμνειν."[45] However one chooses to punctuate between vv. 426–427 of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, I believe that πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα must be taken with what precedes. In the end, regardless whether one opts for single (my own preference) or multiple felloes in the Hesiod, the importance of the passage for the present purposes is that, *pace* West, it provides evidence of bent wood being used to make a wheel.

For help in visualizing the action of the *Bacchae* simile, we may turn to another simile, at Theoc. 25. 247–251 (Gow), which contains a vivid description of the process of bending a strip of heated wood into a felloe,

---

[41] For the evidence, see Jope, "Vehicles and Harness," pp. 548–552; Childe, "Rotary Motion," pp. 212–213. By chance, as I was writing this, I happened to visit the Car and Carriage Museum in Pittsburgh, PA, where I was able to inspect a great quantity of spoked wooden carriage wheels of various sizes from around the turn of the century. They were uniformly made of two bent felloes, bolted together with metal.

[42] Cf. Bruno Snell and Hartmut Erbse, eds., *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (Göttingen, 1955–), s. v. ἁψί(ς), ἅψι(ς), col. 1789. For ἁψίς as "felloe," cf., e.g., the fr. adesp. in Theodorus Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, 3 (Leipzig, 1882), p. 740.

[43] Contra Jope, "Vehicles and Harness," pp. 549–550, who believes that v. 426 refers to the *diameter* of a cross-bar wheel, and that πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα refers to the cutting of timber for the felloes, of which there are then two.

[44] T.A. Sinclair, *Hesiod Works and Days* (London, 1932), pp. 46–47.

[45] M.L. West, *Hesiod Works & Days* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 265–266.

during the course of which the wood escapes the wheelwright's grasp and, with one springing motion, "leaps" (πήδησε) back into its natural state, "far away" (τῆλου) from the artisan. This effect is still called "springback."[46] As it turns out, in Euripides' most belabored description of the component parts of wheels, in the messenger speech describing the chariot crash that took the life of Hippolytus at *Hipp.* 1232–1235, the various detaching parts of the wheels "leap up" (ἄνω … ἐπήδων, same verb) into the air as the crash runs its course. Among the itemized parts of the wheels (which include σύριγγες, ἄξονες, ἐνήλατα) is ἁψῖδα, usually translated with the plural, "rims," but perhaps "felloes" would be more accurate. The image then not only suggests the components flying apart, but also evokes the felloes' natural tendency toward "springback." In Theocritus the violent force of the snap is brought home by the action that provoked the simile: the springing leap of an attacking lion. In Euripides' *Bacchae*, if multiple felloes are involved, the present interpretation assumes a wheel in which they are few in number and bent rather than more numerous and cut into smaller, interlocking segments.[47]

Homer's detailed description of spoked chariot wheels at *Il.* 5. 722–726 is instructive regarding their construction. While the materials cannot be considered typical for an ancient vehicle, the methodical enumeration of the component parts is worth a moment of our attention: Ἥβη δ' ἀμφ' ὀχέεσσι θοῶς βάλε καμπύλα κύκλα, / χάλκεα ὀκτάκνημα, σιδηρέῳ ἄξονι ἀμφίς. / τῶν ἤτοι χρυσέη ἴτυς ἄφθιτος, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε / χάλκε' ἐπίσσωτρα προσαρηρότα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι· / πλῆμναι δ' ἀργύρου εἰσὶ περίδρομοι ἀμφοτέρωθεν·. Observe the following: καμπύλα κύκλα cannot refer simply to the circular nature of the wheel, since καμπύλα implies something *bent*; hence, we hear of a single felloe of gold (χρυσέη ἴτυς) over eight-spoked (real-life Bronze age chariots had only four) bronze wheels with an iron axle. Over the felloes (ὕπερθε) are fitted (προσαρηρότα) bronze tires (ἐπίσσωτρα), likely also made out of single piece of bent metal; finally, the naves or hubs are silver. Wheels with bent, one-piece felloes, such as both Hesiod and Homer describe and are

[46] On the problems associated with "springback" and ways to compensate, see Keyser, "Steambending," passim.

[47] For an illustration of a segmented spoked wheel, see fig. 3C in Marie-Claire Amouretti, "L'artisanat indispensable au fonctionnement de l'agriculture," in *L'Artisanat en Grèce Ancienne: Les productions, les diffusions*, eds. Francine Blondé and Arthur Muller (Paris, 2000), pp. 147–164. On this process, which involves the use of curved molds or "patterns" and a great deal of subsequent shaping, but no actual bending, see Sturt, *The Wheelwright's Shop*, pp. 98–99.

likely at *Ba.* 1066–1067, are extant from late Bronze age Egypt and possibly even earlier in Mesopotamia, as well as the Roman Empire.[48]

There can be no question of a traditional lathe for τόρνῳ at *Ba.* 1067, as its use has nothing in common with the subject to which it is being applied in simile, the bending of a tree, unless one alters the text radically. Albert Rijksbaron is willing to do this, changing γραφόμενος first to γλαφόμενος and later to γλυφόμενος, in order to allow for an image of a solid wheel being chiseled into shape on a traditional lathe.[49] However, the main obstacle to this thesis remains the same, that the point of comparison with the action of Dionysos would be very slim. B.J.J.M. Bongers mounts a formidable, if not entirely convincing, argument that Dionysos is the grammatical subject of a transitive middle rather than passive κυκλοῦτο and that consequently it is his person who is the target of the simile; the author further argues that the simile comprises a unified whole rather than two separate images (as does A.Y. Campbell, who, however, advocates a substantially different text),[50] as it is usually interpreted, and proceeds to the conclusion that a gear-driven lathe or windlass is meant.[51] While impressed by the evidence and the reasoning brought to bear on the passage in question, I remain committed to the more usual intepretation that the tree is the subject of the introductory verb and that there are two distinct components to the simile.

Other commentators who wisely reject the possibility of a traditional lathe are thereby left to come up with some aspect of wheel-making that does not involve this tool. Previous interpretations include (1) a *solid* wheel being turned on a peg in the process of having its circumference marked for final cutting with a string compass and chalk, and (2) a

[48] Childe, "Rotary Motion," p. 212, with fig. 525 (chariot from Thebes, fifteenth century BC); p. 208, with fig. 130 (nail-studded wheel from Susa, ca. 2500 BC); Jope, "Vehicles and Harness," p. 551, with fig. 504 A, an extant Roman example. To my knowledge, no specimen of an actual wheel survives from Greece; cf. H.L. Lorimer, "The Country Cart of Ancient Greece," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 23 (1903), pp. 132–151 (147).

[49] Albert Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae* (Amsterdam, 1991), pp. 141–142; and "Lethe for the Lathe? Euripides, *Bacchae* 1066–67 Again," *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 739–744 (742–743); following L.R. Palmer, "Mortar and Lathe. Notes on Homer Λ 145–147 and Euripides *Bacchae* 1065–1067," *Eranos* 44 (1946), 54–61 (60–61). A traditional lathe is illustr. in Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations*, fig. 3.

[50] A.Y. Campbell, "Notes on Euripides' *Bacchae*," *Classical Quarterly* 50 (1956), 56–67 (65).

[51] Bongers, "Euripides *Bacchae* 1064–9," in an argument that is too complex to summarize here.

primitive piece of equipment called a "pole-lathe" that involves the bending of a wooden pole in order to facilitate the trimming of an, again, solid wheel, but which is not, as far as we know, attested for use by the Greeks. The compass theory, proposed by Tyrrell in the first edition (1892) of his commentary on *Bacchae*, has proved the most durable, as no less an authority than Diggle weighs in with his support in 1998.[52] Euripides' fr. 382. 3–4 (*Theseus*) has been cited in support of τόρνῳ = peg and string compass.[53] The illiterate herdsman is trying to explain the visual appearances of the letters that spell out the name, ΘΗΣΕΥΣ. He characterizes the initial theta in the following way: κύκλος τις ὡς τόρνοισεν ἐκμετρούμενος, / οὗτος δ' ἔχει σημεῖον ἐν μέσῳ σαφές ("A circle as if calculated with compasses, and it has a clear mark in the middle"). This seems a straightforward enough translation of τόρνος in the plural in its particular context. However, Diggle, in support of his interpretation, points out Euripides' coinages of "adjectives from the root τόρνος," at *Tr.* 1156 and 1197[54]—Hector's tower shield, in both cases, where there would seem little justification for an allusion to the compass. These, along with τόρνευμα at *HF* 978, and τορνεύω at *Cy.* 661, both to be discussed below, as I see it, have only in common the notion of something circular, whether a finished shape (somewhat anachronistically in the case of Hector's shield) or a motion. This I would argue allows some leeway in our interpretation of τόρνῳ at *Ba.* 1067.

The pole-lathe theory was proposed by Edward Stanley Robertson, formerly of Trinity College, Dublin, and at the time a retired officer in the Bengal Civil Service, who had seen such a device "at work in the North-west Provinces of India." Robertson reproduces diagrams of this type of lathe in action, while deducing that: "It is in itself probable that the form of lathe used in Greece in the time of Euripides should resemble rather the primitive instrument still surviving in Indian use than the perfect lathe of the English manufacturer."[55] In the second edition of his commentary, Tyrrell quotes Robertson's article extensively, reproduces his diagrams, and notes that he now considers the pole-lathe

[52] Tyrell offers a lengthy account of the history of his proposition and its reception in the 2nd ed. of *The Bacchae of Euripides*, pp. 129–131; James Diggle, "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069," *Eikasmos* 9 (1998), pp. 41–52 (46–51).

[53] Diggle, "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069," p. 47; Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, pp. 37–38.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Edward Stanley Robertson, "Notes on the Bacchae of Euripides," *Hermathena* 3 (1879), 387–393; quotations, pp. 387 and 389, n. 1.

thesis to be "the real solution of the problem presented by the passage."[56] L.R. Palmer had already joined their ranks, as would Campbell: "the interpretation ... of E.S. Robertson ... is exactly right."[57] However, in an overview of the history of scholarship on the simile, Dodds observes with chagrin that the pole-lathe theory "is now widely accepted"; he does not subscribe to it, but is also half-hearted about the compass theory, which Paley, A.H. Cruikshank, Seaford, and Kovacs, in his 2002 translation, endorse.[58] Dodds, Rijksbaron, Seaford, and Diggle, all point to the lack of archaeological evidence for the use of the pole-lathe in Greece, and attempt to dispose once and for all of this pesky theory.[59] Palmer, in favor of the theory, is forced to acknowledge with a degree of discomfort that, if the reading is accepted, *Ba.* 1066–1067 "will constitute the only direct evidence for the use of the pole lathe in Greece."[60] Regarding its usage in Greece, of which I have no independent expertise, I am not at all certain what an expert like Childe has in mind when he observes of the pole-lathe: "While this device is geographically fairly widespread, there is no direct evidence for its use till classical times." He does not elaborate upon this statement, adding only the following: "I believe, but cannot definitely prove, that it was in use in the Bronze age in Mesopotamia and the Indus valley."[61]

In the end the pole-lathe disqualifies itself as the subject of the *Bacchae* simile only incidentally because the existence of this machine in ancient Greece cannot be confirmed. For the wooden pole that gives the pole-lathe its name is bent, not by the hand of the operator, but by the rolling action of the drum on which the wheel is attached, which results in the coiling of a string attached to the pole, a condition which would scarcely justify comparison with Dionysos' action. Furthermore, as critics of the theory have also observed, the pole on this device is bent from a horizontal, rather than a vertical position, another significant departure from what Dionysos does in *Bacchae*. Meanwhile, a major problem with the first theory is that the imaginary wheel would have to be solid, and

---

[56] Tyrrell, *The Bacchae of Euripides*, pp. 129–131; quotation, p. 129.

[57] Palmer, "Mortar and Lathe," pp. 57–61; Campbell, "Notes on Euripides' *Bacchae*," p. 65.

[58] Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 211; Paley^2 2, p. 489; A.H. Cruickshank, *Euripides Bacchae* (1893; 2nd ed., 1923; repr. Oxford, 1934), pp. 54–55; Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, pp. 234–235, Kovacs, *Euripides*, 6.

[59] Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 211; Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations*, p. 140; Seaford, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 235, Diggle, "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069," pp. 49–50.

[60] Palmer, "Mortar and Lathe," p. 61.

[61] Childe, "Rotary Motion," p. 193, with n. 1.

chariot wheels had spokes as early as the Bronze age; although it is by no means certain that a chariot wheel is meant, that deduction has seemed likely to many.[62] More damaging to the compass thesis is the impression that an activity in which only the motion of the hand guiding the wheel can be considered circular hardly does justice to the supernatural force behind the bending of a tree trunk like a bow, a feat of strength which far surpasses even Odysseus' in *Od.* 21. What is most problematic is that neither of the proposed devices, when in operation, conveys a mental picture that bears a close enough resemblance to either the action that the second part of the simile is intended visually to reinforce (i.e., the bending of the tree), as even the supporters of these explanations have acknowledged, or the first part of the simile, the bow. Fortunately, there are preferable options.

The participle γραφόμενος (*Ba.* 1067) remains somewhat cumbersome. However, the context allows for γράφω (here, in the passive) to be taken in the "mathematical" sense, "to describe" or "to generate" (LSJ, s. v. i, 2), often in a manner which does not leave visible traces, as when we say that something "describes" (i.e. "forms") an arc or a circle in its movement.[63] Convexity (κυρτός, LSJ, s. v. i, 2), as opposed to circularity, is not a problem, since the wood in its pliable state is being turned over a convex shape, and in the process itself assuming that shape, whether it ends up a circle (the single felloe theory) or merely a segment of a circle (the multiple felloes theory). The accusative construction περιφορὰν ἑλικοδρόμον can be taken internally as a characterization of the final circular or arced shape of the felloe as dictated by the form of the mold or template. There is no need to be concerned whether the preferred referent for the simile involves a quarter of an arc so as to match literally the path of the tree being dragged to the ground;[64] stringing a bow does not describe a quarter of an arc either. (I say quarter rather than half because it is the *motion* which is being compared (κυκλοῦτο δ' ὥστε), not the final configuration of the bent tree.[65]) I would therefore propose the following

[62] Simple solid cart wheels: Robertson, "Notes on the Bacchae," pp. 389–390; Tyrrell, *The Bacchae of Euripides*, p. 131; Campbell, "Notes on Euripides' *Bacchae*," p. 65; and, more recently, Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations*, and "Lethe for the Lathe?," all pursuing different theories.

[63] Cf. Arist. *Mechanica* 848b9–10; Bongers, "Euripides *Bacchae* 1064–9," p. 85, comes to the same conclusion.

[64] Such matters as Campbell, "Notes on Euripides' *Bacchae*," p. 65; Diggle, "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069," p. 48, among others, have been concerned with.

[65] Cf. Robertson, "Notes on the Bacchae," p. 389, with n. 1.

translation: "it (i.e., the tree) was bent into a curve just as a bow or the convex rim of a wheel formed (γραφόμενος) on a circular mold (τόρνῳ) as to the course of its circumference (περιφορὰν ἑλικοδρόμον)."

Such an interpretation may gain support from Ar. *Th.* 53–54, where Aristophanes' phraseology ventures remarkably close to the imagery of *Ba.* 1066–1067. There, Agathon's slave, in the presence of none other than Euripides, reveals that his master: κάμπτει δὲ νέας ἁψῖδας ἐπῶν, / τὰ δ' τορνεύει, τὰ δ' κολλομελεῖ, κ. τ. λ. ("bends new felloes of words; some he forms on a circular mold [i.e., in one continuous piece], others he patches together,[66] etc."); we have seen how actual felloes can be made using both methods. The major contribution of this passage to the present argument is that it directly allies the process of *bending* (κάμπτει)[67] wood for felloes with the kinds of actions and functions which may be described with the verb τορνεύω,[68] thereby supporting my contention that the τόρνῳ of *Ba.* 1067 can be thought of as a tool used in an operation which requires bending rather than turning. That noted, it is not out of the realm of possibility that the striking imagery of *Ba.* 1066–1067 inspired the Aristophanic joke in the first place.

One final piece of supporting evidence may be introduced before I rest my case. The "Homeric colouring" of the *Bacchae* passage has not escaped observation.[69] But no one, to my knowledge, has noticed that at *Il.* 4. 482–486 we may have the immediate source of inspiration. The Homeric simile is intended to convey the nobility of the Trojan Simoeisius, who has just been felled by Ajax's spear. Homer typically compares fallen warriors to fallen trees, but this simile is definitely out of the ordinary: ὁ δ' ἐν κονίῃσι χαμαὶ πέσεν αἴγειρος ὥς, / ἥ ῥά τ' ἐν εἱαμενῇ ἕλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκει / λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι· / τὴν μέν θ' ἁρματοπηγὸς ἀνὴρ αἴθωνι σιδήρῳ / ἐξέταμ', ὄφρα ἴτυν κάμψῃ περικαλλέϊ δίφρῳ ("and he fell on the ground in the dust, just as a black poplar that has grown in the meadow of a great marsh, smooth, but [for]

---

[66] A coinage by Aristophanes, according to Austin and Olson, *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*, p. 71, who note that κολλάω and its cognates are used of various shop techniques, including joining wood, with examples provided.

[67] The image is not in itself unique; Austin and Olson, *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*, p. 71, draw attention to the use of this verb and its cognates elsewhere in "(generally unfavourable) descriptions of poetic composition," with examples cited.

[68] Austin and Olson, *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*, p. 71, translate "turns on a lathe" and compare Pl. *Phdr.* 234e; however, they fail to explain how felloes might be made using this piece of equipment.

[69] Diggle, "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069"; Bongers, "Euripides *Bacchae* 1064–9," p. 87, n. 9.

the branches which have sprouted on the highest part, this, the chariot-maker with his blazing iron cut down, in order that he might bend a felloe for an exceedingly beautiful chariot"). The species of tree are divergent; for Euripides, height was the important thing (ἐλάτης οὐράνιον ἄκρον, *Ba.* 1064), and he had learned from Homer that, of the tallest trees (δένδρεα μακρά), the alder, the poplar, and the fir, only the last "reaches heavenward" (κλήθρη τ' αἴγειρός τ', ἐλάτη τ' ἦν οὐρανομήκης, *Od.* 5. 238–239). In Homer the picture summoned before the mind's eye is of a tall, straight, virtually branchless, soft-wood tree being bent, bent, bent by a very strong hand into the rim of a wheel. An entire tree! And, it seems, without further alteration by the wheelwright, as if tall, straight, naturally smooth trees, branchless by happenstance, were sought out for this very purpose. Euripides strips the Homeric image of its noble cast (his protagonist is hardly deserving of it), imbues it with more than a touch of black humor, and allows it to attend his Pentheus on that ill-advised, ill-fated launch heavenward. No explanation of *Ba.* 1066–1067, including my own, is without its flaws. However the simile is interpreted, it remains noteworthy in tragic literature for its specificity, its aptness, and its expansive use of technical language.[70] These are features that render the Euripidean image worthy of the acknowledged master of simile, Homer himself.

In another inventive simile that employs craft-based language and imagery, Odysseus at *Cy.* 460–463 compares his intended blinding of the Cyclops by means of a hot, sharpened trunk of a tree with the action of a shipbuilder operating a drill: ναυπηγίαν δ' ὡσεί τις ἁρμόζων ἀνὴρ / διπλοῖν χαλινοῖν τρύπανον κωπηλατεῖ, / οὕτω κυκλώσω δαλὸν ... ("just as some ship's joiner rows the drill back and forth by means of the doubled strap, so I shall drill the firebrand ..."). Later, as the deed is actually being carried out, the chorus of satyrs urge Odysseus on with τόρνευ' ἕλκε ("draw and twist!," v. 661), as if to reiterate the motions suggested by the simile. Aside from *Cy.* 661, Ar. *Th.* 54, and sometimes restored at v. 986 (perhaps not coincidentally, a play in which Euripides is featured), the uncommon verb τορνεύω ("to turn," in operation of some sort of craftsman's tool, LSJ, s. v. i, 1, and ii) appears only in Plato and a very few later sources; it is, however, documented in building

[70] I am somewhat puzzled by Bongers', "Euripides *Bacchae* 1064–9," p. 97, n. 9, contention that the passage is characterized by "an extreme economy of words." I am struck by the opposite, that there is an abundance of technical-sounding language, a situation which has, in part, contributed to the difficulties of interpretation.

inscriptions, a pattern by now familiar when it comes to the tragedian's artisinal language.[71] Euripides' general fondness for nouns and adjectives with τόρνος as a root has already been noted in reference to the *Bacchae* simile.

Commentators have rightly observed a resemblance to Odysseus' preferred simile as he describes the blinding of the Cyclops at *Od.* 9. 383–386.[72] There, however, additional men (οἱ δέ) are required to operate the drill, whereas in *Cyclops* one man (τις ἀνήρ) is capable of operating it alone. Two types of stationary drill, operated on the same principle but differently, are indeed attested in antiquity. The strap drill, where the two ends of a cord or strap for propelling the drill had to be hand held, normally required at least one assistant to manage the strap, whereas the bow drill, where the ends of the strap are fastened tautly to a bow, allowed the mason, carpenter, or gem-cutter to work alone, with one hand maneuvering the bow, the other guiding the head of the drill.[73] Panels 5 and 6 of the Telephos frieze from the Hellenistic Altar of Zeus at Pergamon show carpenters building a boat in which Auge is to be cast out to sea, one of whom is shown operating a bow drill.[74] The same tool is referred to as a "running drill" when it held at a 45-degree angle or so and propelled in two directions, downward and forward, in order to remove material in the creation of a channel. While both the strap drill and the bow drill are used by carpenters, the running drill cannot be used on wood because it

---

[71] Several times in the accounts of the Erechtheum (e.g., *IG* I^3 475. 259) as well as in a fourth-century BC building inscription from Eleusis (*IG* II^2 1675. 22).

[72] D.M. Simmonds and R.R. Timberlake, *Euripides. The Cyclops* (Cambridge, Eng., 1957), p. 43.

[73] Drills are in use in Greek sculpture at least from the sixth century onwards, and much earlier in the ancient Near East, though there is controversy as to when the so-called "running drill" (a term which refers to the manner of usage rather than to a separate tool) was introduced. See Olga Palagia, "Marble Carving Techniques," in *Greek Sculpture. Function, Materials, and Techniques in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, ed. Olga Palagia (Cambridge, Eng., 2006), pp. 243–279 (253–260, on the use of the drill, and fig. 81, a photograph of a modern sculptor singlehandedly operating a bow drill). Cf. Sheila Adam, *The Technique of Greek Sculpture in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 40–42 and fig. 5a, a diagram drawing of the strap drill in use; for a drawing of the bow drill, see Ling, *Making Classical Art*, fig. 10g.

[74] Illustr. in Renée Dreyfus and Ellen Schraudolph, *Pergamon. The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar*, 1 (San Francisco, CA, 1996), cat. nos. 2 and 3. Ling, *Making Classical Art*, fig. 14, shows a scene engraved on a slab of stone from the catacomb of St. Helena in Rome of a strap drill operated by two men. For references to additional ancient representations of the bow drill in use, see Palagia, "Marble Carving Techniques," p. 253; Adam, *The Technique of Greek Sculpture*, p. 41.

would cause the wood to splinter along its grain.[75] Therefore, we should picture a bow drill in *Cyclops*, since only one man is working it, and a strap drill in the *Odyssey*, where at least three men are working it. It is true that Euripides neglects to mention the bow specifically, but its presence may be inferred given that the joiner himself is handling the "doubled strap" (διπλοῖν χαλινοῖν) and that it is described as being "worked like an oar" (κωπηλατεῖ), which would better suit the motion generated by the manipulation of a bow than of two ends of a strap held one in each hand with the hands close together, as required by the strap drill. Why the preference for a one-man drill in *Cyclops*? Clearly, this is a one-man adventure, and its hero is Odysseus. He includes no one else in his plans for blinding the Cyclops as he lays them out in *Cy.* 451–463 (note the steady sequence of first-person singular verbs); hence, when he gets round to the simile, it too must feature a sole operator.[76]

A clever use of language suggestive of the production of columns on a lathe at *HF* 977–978, a passage already introduced, is now worth a closer look. In his murderous rage Heracles pursues one of his sons around a column until finally dispatching him. The action is described in terms that recall the artisanal activity of "turning" (τόρνευμα) which would have been necessary to produce the column: ὁ δ' ἐξελίσσων παῖδα κίονος κύκλῳ / τόρνευμα δεινὸν ποδός, ἐναντίον σταθεὶς / βάλλει πρὸς ἧπαρ. Translate: "But he, chasing the child in a circle around the column, [with] an awesome pivot of the foot, reversed course to oppose him, [and] launched [the missile] toward his heart." The noun τόρνευμα is rare indeed, appearing only on this occasion in extant poetry, and otherwise in technical treatises.[77] The verbal form τορνεύω, which we have just encountered at *Cy.* 661, is less rare, but more importantly, documented in building inscriptions, including one from Eleusis which deals with the centering of column drums (*IG* II^2 1675. 22), strongly suggesting that it is a technical term, perhaps with more than one craft function.

There are minor difficulties with interpretation of the text as it stands, which Paley and Bond review.[78] They do not, however, greatly affect the

[75] Adam, *The Technique of Greek Sculpture*, pp, 61–62.

[76] While the chorus exhort Odysseus and his men (?) in the cave with verbs in the second person plural at *Cy.* 656–660, their cry of τόρνευ' ἕλκε at v. 661 is in the singular, as if the companions have turned into spectators during the final phase of the deed, leaving center stage to Odysseus.

[77] LSJ, *TLG*, s. v.

[78] Paley[1] 3, pp. 71–72, with some important changes in Paley[2] 3, p. 74; Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 316–317, upon which the following discussion is based.

exegesis about to be offered. Paley, in his first edition, has τόρνευμα as "the accusative in apposition to the sentence" and notes the "aptness of the comparison between a man chasing a child rapidly round a pillar, and a piece of wood turned on a lathe," while Bond, with Barlow, prefers to regard the phrase as an internal accusative.[79] No one questions that the image (while perhaps not properly metaphor, it seems at the very least, a pun) concerns the commonality of motion between the turning on a lathe of the shaft of the very column (if it is made of wood) or its drums (if made of stone, more likely) and the pattern of movement (ἐξελίσσων ... κύκλῳ) of the father pursuing the son around it.[80] As the thrust of a lathe (or a potter's wheel) is inevitably outward, there need be no problem with ἐξελίσσων, which gave Bond cause for concern;[81] while the thrust is outward, the artisan is there to contain and manipulate it, just as the boy clings to the contours of the column in his flight. Paley's emendation, in the second edition of his commentary, of κύκλῳ το κυκλῶν, to be then taken with τόρνευμα ... ποδός, effectively eliminates the colorful image that he himself had suggested on the earlier occasion, which is not mentioned at all in the newer edition; the emendation, however, has not been followed. I too believe that κίονος κύκλῳ should be retained. The dative might be construed as instrumental alluding to the fact that the "spinning" effect which the chase took on was a direct result of the configuration of the column around which the two were forced to run; in this reading the "shape" of the chase mimics the shape of the column's cross section, that is, circular, which I have argued is the core meaning of words in the τόρνος group. As I see it the action should be envisioned in the following way: a brief circular chase around a column during which Heracles abruptly stops cold and pivots on one foot (τόρνευμα ... ποδός) to confront his child face to face (ἐναντίον σταθείς).[82] As a literal description of the action this reading would require τόρνευμα δεινὸν ποδός to be construed as an internal accusative, but it need not exclude

[79] Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 167.

[80] Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 140–141, also notes of the messenger speech of *HF* 922–1015, which includes the passage under discussion, that: "Metaphors and similes drawn from the world of work and crafts bring home the realism and reinforce the violence." Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, as is this brilliant scholar's disappointing habit, shows no interest in the artisanal overtones of τόρνευμα.

[81] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 316.

[82] Rather than a circular movement (for this he compares *El.* 561), Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 215, prefers to think of a frenzied sequence of twists and turns in response to each other's moves, until the son is at last outmaneuvered.

the possibility of a polyvalent reading of the phrase simultaneously in apposition to the sentence and as such as a kind of metaphor for the action.

The Language of Art Criticism

From language and imagery that seems as if drawn from the practical inner workings of the artisanat, we now turn to a different category of craft-based language, still appropriated considered "technical," though inspired for the most part by ideas. It includes a group of words that, while they may have their place in general speech, also happen to be conceptually potent ancient art critical terms, whose definition and application continue to generate controversy despite decades of scholarly analysis. My intent is not to resolve any one of these thorny issues, but rather to highlight Euripides' apparent awareness of the technical art critical nature of his choice of language and how he exploited the opportunities it presented for intriguing linguistic and imagistic ambiguity—or clarity, as the case may be.

As a rule, I include in this category those terms that occur in Euripides and are found in J.J. Pollitt's invaluable monograph on ancient art critical terminology, *The Ancient View of Greek Art* (New Haven, 1974), which remains the only large scale treatment of the subject. Unlike the bulk of the language treated thus far, many of these terms cannot necessarily lay claim to roots in actual artisanal vocabulary. Some almost certainly represent a technical appropriation of a common term, rather than the other way around, in other words, an increasingly specialized use of general vocabulary. Regardless of the precise origin of a given term under consideration, to the extent that this can be recovered, we do know that at some point it was conscripted to serve the intellectual purpose of illuminating the aesthetics or logistics of ancient art. Even if a first certainly technical usage can only be documented in the fourth century, for instance, in the works of Plato or Aristotle, this is not proof that transference occurred only after Euripides wrote. The technical appropriation may already have occurred, recorded perhaps in a lost architect's or artist's treatise, or was simply "in the air" in the fifth century. Plato (or Socrates) and Aristotle did not invent the technical language documented in their works, when they turned, as they did frequently, to the language of craft to make philosophical points. Under the circumstances, it would hardly have served their purposes to coin new usages or select language that

was unfamiliar. Rather, when speaking outside of strict philosophy, the philosopher would reasonably be expected to cite terms and concepts that were already familiar to his readers and interlocutors. Those familiar, in the later fifth century, likely included the tragedian, Euripides. For the effortlessness with which the following terms are deployed, as we shall see, suggests that the playwright possessed at least a passing acquaintance with contemporary art critical terminology to complement an impressive understanding of practical matters.

σχῆμα

A good case in point is σχῆμα. It is derived from ἔχω (LSJ, s. v.), probably with an original sense of "bearing." In visual terms σχῆμα may be translated "format," "composition," "figure," "shape," "configuration," or "design," in accordance with the specific context.[83] (There appears to be no justification for translating "outline," as is sometimes done.) Not a major art critical term, according to Pollitt, Xenophon's *Memorabilia* 3. 10. 7 marks the first extant appearance of σχῆμα in this capacity; it is used sporadically afterwards, and only becomes popular in the first century AD or later.[84] Thus we should not expect σχῆμα to have an art critical frame of reference on every occasion in which it appears in Euripides; what is noteworthy is that more than a few arguably do.[85] Transposed into figurative or metaphorical terms, the sense is often "*merely* a format, composition, figure" and so forth, in the way that all representational art is to some degree to be regarded as a mere counterfeit of nature, if not necessarily an inferior version.

Such is the case in fr. 360. 26–27 (*Erec.*), where the wonderful ambiguity that often accompanies the appropriation of an art critical term in a literary context is on full display. Praxithea, who has only daughters, rhetorically entertains a wish for sons who would fight on behalf of their city but who would also "stand out" or "be conspicuous or distinguished" (πρέποι) among men, as opposed to "σχήματα having been engendered in the city." While the intent is not entirely certain, clearly something unflattering is meant by this use of σχῆμα. At its simplest the term could be nothing more than a synonym for "work of art" as opposed to "real,

---

83 Cf. Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 260, with n. 1.

84 Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 260.

85 Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 224, ad loc. *Ph.* 252, conveniently summarizes the uses of σχῆμα in E., and offers some interesting nuances of interpretation.

living person," in other words, a paltry approximation of the desired reality. Alternatively, it could imply a contrast in a kind of general, abstract sense between two- and three-dimensions, between flatness and prominence and all that that entails, in both the physical and the metaphorical aspect. Or the point of contrast may lie between animate and inanimate, as between a living person and a painted or sculpted place-taker. Pollitt argues that σχῆμα is something of a late-arriving, popular counterpart to or parallel for ῥυθμός (see below), the term most often used in ancient art criticism of the configuration of a figure in movement, and often associated with the works of Pythagoras of Rhegion (D.L. 8. 47).[86] It is clear from the passage of Xenophon mentioned above that σχῆμα was used in the late fifth century of artists' successful and convincing representations of figures in movement. Perhaps, in the lines from *Erechtheus*, real action is being contrasted with the *illusion* of action suggested by σχήματα artificially formulated by artists to *imply* movement in statues and in pictures. Something similar happens at *Ph.* 250–252: ἀμφὶ δὲ πτόλιν νέφος / ἀσπίδων πυκνὸν φλέγει / σχῆμα φοινίου μάχας ("and about the city a dense cloud of shields flashes brightly, the picture of murderous battle").[87] Here, the shimmering mass of shields creates the sensation of a motion picture.

In another occurrence of σχῆμα that suggests an awareness of the last mentioned, narrower art-critical meaning of the term, fr. 25. 2–3 (*Aiolos*) contains the following "old riddle": γέροντες οὐδέν ἐσμεν ἄλλο πλὴν ὄχλος / καὶ σχῆμ', ὀνείρων δ' ἕρπομεν μιμήματα· ("when we get old we are nothing other than a throng of motionless movements, and we creep along as imitations of dreams"). What we have is an obvious commentary on the insubstantiality of the existences of old persons, on the ineffectual nature of their movements, in the manner of painted figures or statues which appear as if they are in motion but do not actually move, or as in an imitation of something (a dream image) which is itself already an imitation. Two striking visual images—one of a throng of statues in a permanent state of ineffectual movement (= ὄχλος καὶ σχῆμα, translated as a hendiadys), the other of figures *mimicking* the futile

---

[86] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 261 and 218–228, on ῥυθμός.

[87] I follow the text of Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, who, op. cit., p. 224, defends his reading of σχῆμα at v. 252, which has manuscript authority but is often replaced by the more colorless σῆμα, a conjecture by Heimsoeth (e.g., Diggle, Kovacs, *Euripides*, 5). Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae*, p. 95, also in defense of σχῆμα at *Ph.* 252, which he calls "thoroughly Euripidean," observes astutely that it "denotes the sensual presentation of an object by which we are aware of its identity."

motions of figures in dreams—combine in a powerful evocation of the powerlessness of old age. On a lighter note, at *Cy.* 220–221 the Cyclops, despite his uncivilized demeanor and lifestyle, is apparently aware of this particular sense of σχῆμα as an art critical term when he tells Coryphaeus that he will not, after all, eat him, since, with Coryphaeus' jumping around (πηδῶντες) in the depths of his stomach, he (the Cyclops) will be destroyed ὑπὸ τῶν σχημάτων (literally, "by the configurations of his body in movement"). On the other hand, σχῆμα represents a good "configuration" of character when it is used of a man who helps others at *IA* 983, and similarly of the act of invoking the gods at *Tr.* 470—both more or less abstract uses of the term.

Creusa's "bearing" (σχῆμα) is recognized as noble by Ion at *Ion* 238 and 240, in which cases the term refers to, as Mastronarde confirms, her "external appearance" or to an overall "visual impression" of the woman.[88] Similarly, τὸ σχῆμα refers to Heracles' proud (σεμνός) bearing at fr. 688. 2 (*Syleus*).[89] The term is used in a general sense of "aspect" "arrangement," or "way of wearing clothes" at *Ba.* 832, and probably also of "dress" at *IT* 246.[90] Demosthenes' *De Falsa Legatione* 251 might be compared, where the σχῆμα of a statue of Solon is judged to be not properly of Solon's time; this likely refers both to the general "aspect" but more specifically to its manner of dress.[91] The term is used in a straightforward way of "form" or "shape" in the physical sense at *Hel.* 379, *Med.* 1072, and tautologically, together with μορφῆς, at *Ion* 992 and *IT* 292;[92] in the abstract sense, "state," at *Med.* 1039; and in verbal form, σχηματίζεται, of the arranging of hair at *Med.* 1161. On the other hand, there is a further nuance beyond "shape" or "form" at fr. 210. 2 (*Antiope*): θηρὸς κακούργου σχήματ' ἐκμιμούμενον ("imitating the motions of a lascivious beast"), said of Zeus. Here, σχήματα is likely to incorporate movement, since Zeus is misbehaving (or possibly impersonating a satyr)

---

88 Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 224, ad loc. *Ph.* 252.

89 Some mss. have πρόσχημα, followed by N^2.

90 Regarding the last, cf. Cropp, *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 191; σχῆμ' is Monk's emendation—which Kyriakou, *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 111, calls "ingenious"—of mss. ὄνομα.

91 Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 259, passage #2, suggests that the "format" was wrong, referring to the fourth-century style of depicting orators or statesmen with their himations wrapped around them and their hands folded.

92 See Kyriakou, *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, pp. 123–124, for the critical history of this difficult passage.

in bed.[93] It is also well to recall our discussion in Chapter Two of εὐσχήμων at *Hec.* 569, where it characterizes the decorous fall of the dying Polyxena, who has just been compared to either a statue or a painting. The "shape" of her landing, which is both lovely and "seemly," that is, modest, is the intent here. On the other hand one must beware of words that are εὐσχήμων ("well-shaped," or "fancy"), as at *Med.* 584[94] and *Hipp.* 490, where they are directed toward suspiciously deceitful ends.

Yet another distinct category of what might be called idiomatic uses of σχῆμα are the vocative addresses. Admetus greets his house, now empty of Alcestis, as if it were but a hollow shell, when he calls it ὦ σχῆμα δόμων at *Alc.* 912. Mastronarde suggests that it is a sign of "familiarity," but it is hard to see how the house would endear itself to Admetus at this point.[95] Hecuba addresses her house with the same language at *Hec.* 619, with feelings even more obviously poignant; again, I think, loss and emptiness, and the fact that the house is but a shadow of its former self are the themes that inspire the image.[96] In reference to *Alc.* 912 Parker points out that "this type of periphrasis with σχῆμα is used only in apostrophes, and only by Euripides and (once) by Sophocles" (*Ph.* 952).[97] I wonder whether this unusual Euripidean idiom is owed to the tragedian's awareness of a special nuance of the art critical term of which we are unaware.

If so, this would help to account for Andromache's use of the term in an invocation to her native city at *Andr.* 1: Ἀσιάτιδος γῆς σχῆμα, Θηβαία πόλις. Mastronarde's explanation that σχῆμα here alludes to the beauty of the land is not very convincing, in my view.[98] Lloyd translates "shape of the Asian land," explaining that its use is periphrastic "in emotional apostrophe of one's home, apparently suggesting the impression made on the speaker's mind by something long familiar."[99] Stevens treats the epithet most extensively. After reviewing the editorial history of interpretation of the present passage along with comparanda, he concludes that the term is

[93] Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, p. 310, recalls that a version of the myth has Zeus impregnating Antiope in the guise of a satyr. For κακοῦργος used of sexual misbehavior, with Euripidean comparanda, see Collard, loc. cit.

[94] "Seemly façade," according to Mastronarde, *Euripides Medea*, p. 267.

[95] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 224, ad loc. *Ph.* 252; cf. A.M. Dale, *Euripides Alcestis* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 117–118, Conacher, *Euripides Alcestis*, p. 191.

[96] Cf. Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, p. 164; Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 224, ad loc. *Ph.* 252, suggests "pride."

[97] Parker, *Euripides Alcestis*, p. 234.

[98] Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, p. 224, ad loc. *Ph.* 252; cf. Hyslop, *The Andromache of Euripides*, p. 51, who cites the scholiast's καλλώπισμα.

[99] Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 108, with comparanda.

a periphrasis with a restricted frame of reference, translating, anticlimactically, "O Asian land, O city of Thebes."[100] Its geographical significance and importance in Asia are the most likely sources of inspiration for this use of σχῆμα. Perhaps something like "backbone" might be a better, if loose, translation, in the same way that in a work of art the "design" can be considered both the essence of the work and the invisible skeletal framework upon which shapes, forms, and colors are built. In the end, however, it may be best to follow Stevens' lead and refrain from pushing the expression too far. The same trope appears again in fr. 476 (*Likymnios*): Τευθράντιον δὲ σχῆμα Μυσίας χθονός. Both may be colorless in tone.

ῥυθμός/εὐρύθμως

Two highly important art critical terms that appear not infrequently in Euripides may be grouped together for the purposes of the present study: ῥυθμός (*Cy.* 398; *El.* 772; *Heracl.* 130; *Supp.* 94) and εὐρύθμως (*Cy.* 563).[101] Though ῥυθμός and its cognates are among the most analyzed and debated in the literature, the parameters of the terms, from both the technical and conceptual standpoints, have yet to be definitively established. Pollitt's thorough account of the issues surrounding the art critical significance of the terms ῥυθμός and εὐρυθμία, along with his catalog of the appropriate ancient sources and commentary, are still current and valid; hence, several of his conclusions are summarized here.[102] To begin with ῥυθμός: Pollitt effectively disconnects the ancient idea of ῥυθμός from its modern connotations of regular repetitive sounds or movements. There is no incongruity in seeing movement as a series of pauses or rests or as a series of still "patterns" assumed by the body in motion, deliberately selected examples of which when captured in visual form may be seen to embody the essence of an action or a movement in a convincing fashion. All ancient visual art forms that sought to represent

---

[100] Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 85.

[101] Two additional appearances of the adjective εὔρυθμος are too textually uncertain to be of use: At fr. 472e. 16 (*Cret.*), it is the preferred reading of Collard, in Collard, Cropp, and Lee (cf. Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7), whereas Kannicht (*TrGF* 5) is noncommittal; and fr. 439. 3 (*Hipp. Kal.*), where it has a complex textual history, but is accepted neither by Kannicht nor Collard and Cropp. Pauer, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*, p. 106, associates E.'s use of ῥυθμός exclusively with the art of poetry.

[102] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 218–228 and 169–181. See also the discussion of the concepts of ῥυθμός and σχῆμα as related to movement in art, architecture, and among the pre-Socratics in Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, pp. 46–48.

virtual movement, animation, and life were subject to the limitations of actual stillness, whereas modern time-based media, including cinematic photography, are able to circumvent this liability.

Pollitt offers the example of a pendulum of a clock. If an artist desires to render visually the motion of a pendulum, he or she would do well to represent it at one of the two extreme points in its swing, when it pauses slightly before changing direction, rather than, for instance, in a vertical position.[103] The pioneering work of the nineteenth century English photographer Eadweard Muybridge, who recorded for the first time, in a series of still photographs, the human figure and the horse in movement, demonstrates this principle cogently. What we see in these images is motion broken into pieces and revealed as to its constituent parts, its mechanics laid bare in the form of a sequence of distinct two-dimensional shapes or patterns, no two alike. Muybridge's photographs showed once and for all that there is no repetition in regular movement. This is the sense in which ῥυθμός should be understood as an art critical term. The application of the principle of ῥυθμός to works of art appears to have originated among Early Classical sculptors, especially Myron and Pythagoras of Rhegion, who is said to have "aimed at" *rhythmos* and *summetria* in his works (D.L. 8. 47). Since we do not have any preserved works of the latter, and since Pliny (34. 58) tells us that Myron also achieved these qualities, the works of Myron are usually cited as examples of Early Classical ῥυθμός in a work of sculpture, in particular the famous "Discobolos," known only from copies, with its unmistakable "pattern" that functions almost as a hieroglyph for the act of throwing a discus. It is important to add that the notion of ῥυθμός as "pattern" or "shape" can also exist *independent* of any suggestion of movement, and εὐρυθμία as an art critical term devolves for the most part from this aspect of ῥυθμός.[104]

On the other hand, εὐρυθμία is both more complex—in that it involves a degree of subjective judgment about whether or not a work of ancient art, in fact, has it—and more simple, in that its wide-ranging appearances in our ancient sources seem to imply a level of assumption about quality in a work of art that has much in common with modern

[103] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 225, n. 5; cf. p. 227.

[104] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 177. So it may be interpreted as a reference to the overall design of the fourth Apollo temple at Delphi at Pi. *Pa.* 8. 104 (Rutherford), the only occurrence of the term in Pindar, according to Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans*, pp. 218–219, who is led somewhat astray in his commentary in assuming that "flowing motion" would properly be involved.

sensibilities. Pollitt, however, confronts the ancient evidence directly; he casts aside the often convoluted, ingenious attempts to explain the term, preferring instead to base his interpretation directly upon his analysis of ῥυθμός, to which the compound form bears a clear-cut relationship.[105] In justification of his decision Pollitt relies mostly on a sensible, literal interpretation of what he calls the "earliest known use of the term in connection with the visual arts," in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (3. 10. 10–12), which involves a rather lengthy exchange between Socrates and the armorer Pistias about what εὔρυθμος means with regard to a breastplate.[106] Pollitt concludes that, because Pistias successfully argues that a form-fitted breastplate can be εὔρυθμος despite the fact that the person for whom it is fitted is ill-shaped (ἀρρύθμῳ σώματι), we must conclude that εὔρυθμος can mean "well shaped with respect to its wearer," or, at least in the case of a suit of armor, "well-fitted." I follow Pollitt in allowing that εὐρυθμία refers simply to a state of being "well-shaped" or "well-formed," as ῥυθμός refers to "shape" or "form."

With this background in place, let us now consider the Euripidean uses of the terms. At *El.* 772 Electra begs the messenger to reveal ποίῳ τρόπῳ δὲ καὶ τίνι ῥυθμῷ φόνου ("in what manner and with what configuration of slaughter") did her brother Orestes accomplish the murder of Aegisthus. There is no mistaking the tone of sadistic eagerness in Electra's questions: ποίῳ τρόπῳ expects a detailed narration of the setting and the events of the murder, which is in fact subsequently provided (vv. 774–858), while τίνι ῥυθμῷ awaits a *visual* characterization of the very act of dying, in other word's, what the man's death throes looked like and how his body was configured at their end. This too the messenger volunteers at vv. 838–843, in an excruciatingly protracted word picture of the final moments of one of Greek tragedy's goriest deaths.[107] There is an unmistakable staccato rhythm in the description of the death, as if we are witnessing a series of motion picture stills. The asyndeton (aided by the colloquialism, ἄνω κάτω) of vv. 842–843 (πᾶν δὲ σῶμ' ἄνω κάτω / ἤσπαιρεν ἠλέλιζε δυσθνῄσκων φόνῳ, "dying

[105] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 177–181.

[106] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 177–178; in a footnote the author, op. cit., p. 177, n. 2, acknowledges E. *Cy.* 563 among the "earliest preserved [one assumes non-art critical] uses" of the term, along with Ar. *Th.* 121 and *Pl.* 759, where it refers to music and dancing. Curiously, though, he translates the Euripidean passage "with good form," that is, with exactly the sense that he attributes to the art critical usage in Xenophon; in general, Pollitt seems reluctant to use poetic sources to make his points.

[107] Cf. Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 154: "… the murder of Aeg. is an ugly event."

horrifically by murder, he struggled, he wailed, in every fiber of his body") more vividly than any further description leaves in its wake an indelible image of the shape and form of a human body relinquishing its life horribly, painfully, and with great resistance. Paley translates τίνι ῥυθμῷ "order," "succession," or "fixed plan," ignoring the visual altogether.[108]

Denniston correctly realizes that the choice of language is intended to highlight the visual aspects of the murder, but neglects to emphasize that ῥυθμός also has an important function as an art critical term: "ῥυθμός is the ordering and synthesis of long and short sounds, as σχῆμα is the ordering and synthesis of visible objects. The two words are closely allied in sense: ῥυθμός is often used for σχῆμα, in the visual sense, and σχῆμα would have been a more normal word to use here."[109] While it is true that the applications of the two terms overlap, one (ῥυθμός) happens to be a major art critical term with a specific technical application in the art of sculpture, while the other is less significant, and is used much more loosely among the arts. That ῥυθμός and σχῆμα sometimes appear to be synonyms is more likely to be due to our own incomplete understanding of the precise meanings of the terms in ancient art criticism, as well as to inconsistencies and laxity in usages among the ancient sources themselves, which typically occurs when technical terminology is appropriated for outside purposes. As I see it, one difference is that σχῆμα can, and often does, incorporate actual movement, whereas ῥυθμός does not.

On other occasions in Euripides ῥυθμός alludes to the overall visual aspect of a person or of a scene as it is transmitted in an instant to an objective observer, whether as a first impression or, in the case of Aegisthus, a last. Thus Theseus, newly arrived from Athens, espies his mother Aithra and the other suppliant women at the shrine of Demeter at Eleusis (*Supp.* 93–97). He is shocked to see the multiple signs of distress that the women share, the teary eyes, the shorn hair, the non-festive attire, calling the visible signs the women exhibit, using litotes, οὐχ ἕνα ῥυθμὸν / κακῶν ("not a uniform pattern of misery," vv. 94–95). The use of ῥυθμός in this context is puzzling if one thinks only in terms of the standard, non-art critical connotations.[110] Obviously it is not possible

---

[108] Paley² 2, p. 372.

[109] Denniston, *Euripides Electra*, p. 146.

[110] E.g., Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, p. 137, who translates: "various is the manner of their grief," explaining "not only do they weep, they also have shorn hair and wear the clothes of mourning (95–97)." Cf. Morwood, *Euripides Suppliant Women*, p. 153: "who express their grief in various ways."

to think of movement, since the outward "signs" are itemized (vv. 95–97) and none requires a temporal dimension in order to be rendered apparent and meaningful to the eye. It is as if Theseus, and the audience along with him, confront a tableau or frieze of suffering, which breaks down into the various, visibly evident "patterns" or "shapes" by which it can be recognized. Euripides' language in this passage is natural and unobtrusive as he defers to the visual arts as superior communicators of human suffering on the assumption that many members of his audience would be familiar with ῥυθμός as an art-critical term and be prepared to participate fully in his solemn picture of mourning.

Something similar applies at *Heracl.* 130–131, when the herald Copreus is recognized as to his ethnicity by the following: στολήν γ' Ἕλληνα καὶ ῥυθμὸν πέπλων / ἔχει ("he has Greek gear and the arrangement of his clothes is Greek"), an impression which is belied by his actions, which are those of a barbarian. Two things lead to the conclusion that he is Greek, the man's overall physical appearance (στολήν) and the distinctive manner in which he dresses.[111] In view of Pollitt's interpretation of the crucial passage from Xenophon, above, it might be preferable to translate ῥυθμόν here "fit," rather than "shape," "form," or "arrangement." Yet it is again the immediate visible configuration of signs and appearances, a snapshot photograph, if you will, of an action or a situation frozen in time and impressed upon the memory for future recounting that justifies the use of ῥυθμός.

When we left the Cyclops at *Cy.* 220–221 he had been fretting about the possibility of death by σχήματα. Thus, when we are confronted with its synonym ῥυθμὸς at *Cy.* 398, we are fully prepared for indignities to be heaped upon this prim and proper word, as well. Polyphemus kills two of Odysseus' men ῥυθμῷ θ' ἑνί. Their deaths are described separately (τὸν μέν, τὸν δ'); the first appears to go straight into the pot while the other has his brains knocked out against a rock, although Diggle assumes a lacuna after the line which would presumably have characterized more fully the death of the first man to parallel the description of that of the second. If there is a lacuna, as seems likely, we can never know for sure

[111] According to Pearson, *Euripides. The Heraclidae*, p. 56: "The distinction made is between the dress itself and the manner of wearing it." However, I see στολήν as a reference to the man's entire ensemble, not solely to his peplos. Cf. Paul Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates. The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*, trans. Alan Shapiro (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford, 1995), pp. 48–49 and 60, on proper deportment, including the draping of one's garment, as "an outward manifestation of the 'interior order' expected of the good citizen" (op. cit., p. 60).

whether ῥυθμῷ θ' ἑνί refers solely to the action involved in killing the first man or whether it indicates that the Cyclops picked one man up in each hand at the same time, perhaps dashing one's head against the cauldron, the other's against a rock. At any rate, it makes little difference to our understanding of the meaning of ῥυθμός as "shape" or "pattern" of the body, in line with fifth-century art critical usage of the term; again avoiding any association with movement per se. In this case it is easy to imagine the Cyclops' arms in a spiraling swastika formation, a greatly exaggerated version of Myron's "Discobolos," with one man in each hand about to meet his dreadful end. "In one rhythm" would be a perfectly comprehensible description of the act, especially if an audience member were familiar with recent developments in the visual arts. The comparable pose (i.e., one up, one down) of the arms of the satyr in what is probably to be identified as Myron's "Athena and Marsyas" (identified in various copies) is mimicked in an irreverent depiction of the group on an Attic red-figure oinochoe from the end of the fifth century.[112] Pollitt is mistaken, I believe, when he includes *Cy.* 398 in his list of fifth-century uses of the term to signify "the 'time' or 'order' of an action in which repetition is involved—for example, marching or dancing—and [for which] the familiar modern connotation of the word is clearly applicable," in direct contradiction to the art critical meaning of the term as he himself defines it.[113] In fact it is the opposite: The Cyclops kills the two men *with one* ῥυθμός, not with successive motions or actions or in any kind of order. Here is a case in which an understanding of the art critical usage of the term is essential to interpretation.

A final encounter, this time, with the adverbial form of ῥυθμὸς, occurs at *Cy.* 563; by this time the audience is primed to expect the technical term to be deployed irreverently, and Euripides does not disappoint. The giant is instructed by Silenus to θές νυν τὸν ἀγκῶν' εὐρύθμως κᾆιτ' ἔκπιε ("crook your elbow just so [demonstration follows] and then drink up"). Pollitt translates εὐρύθμως "with good form," while LSJ has "gracefully."[114] The conspicuous presence of this normally sedate word in a humorous context, however, suggests that the image is visually richer than either of these translations would indicate. I suspect that

---

[112] Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, pp. 341–343, with fig. 113b–d; for copies that have been associated with the lost group and a reconstruction drawing, see Boardman, *GSC*, figs. 61–63.

[113] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 221, with n. 3.

[114] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 177, n. 2.

our attention, and the Cyclops', is being drawn to the shape (ῥυθμός) attained by the properly calibrated attitude of the bent elbow, and that the demonstration of the gesture was perhaps accompanied by a dramatic flourish: ὥσπερ μ' ὁρᾷς πίνοντα χὤσπερ οὐκ ἐμέ ("just as you see me drinking and just as you don't!," v. 564).

ἰδέα

Although it is not documented for use in visual art criticism (it does not appear in Pollitt), the Platonic term ἰδέα makes its only appearance in tragedy at *Ba.* 471.[115] This alone makes it worthy of our attention, besides which it is linguistically associated with a verb of sight (ὁράω). In a stichomythic exchange between Pentheus and Dionysos concerning the source of the Stranger's professed knowledge of Bacchic rites, the line in which it appears finds itself sandwiched between dialogue laced with words and images of looking, seeing, and knowing (vv. 469–472):

Pe.: πότερα δὲ νύκτωρ σ' ἢ κατ' ὄμμ' ἠνάγκασεν; ("Did he pressure you by night (i.e., in a dream) or before your eyes?")

Di.: ὁρῶν ὁρῶντα, καὶ δίδωσιν ὄργια. ("Face to face, and he gave the rites.")

Pe.: τὰ δ' ὄργι' ἐστὶ τίν' ἰδέαν ἔχοντά σοι; ("And the rites, what do they look like to you?")

Di.: ἄρρητ' ἀβακχεύτοισιν εἰδέναι βροτῶν. ("It is disallowed for uninitiated mortals to know (i.e., by having seen).")

While the temptation may be to take ἰδέαν in an abstract sense "sort," I believe it must be resisted. As Dodds points out, the synonym εἶδος is commonly used in Greek tragedy of physical appearance.[116] Moreover, we are pointedly presented with an aggregation of sight words in the immediate vicinity of the term: κατ' ὄμμα, ὁρῶν, ὁρῶντα, εἰδέναι; and in this context, σοι at v. 471 should also be counted. Then there is the fact that Pentheus, throughout the play, makes it clear that he is interested in *seeing* the Bacchae in the act of performing their rites, a compulsive urge which Dionysos is willing to accommodate, and which is ultimately satisfied only when the god miraculously allows him access to the tip of a fir tree at the top of a mountain. Once there, of course, it turns out

---

115 Cf. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. 137.
116 Ibid.

that he has positioned himself not only *for* a view, but also *in* view of the maddened women, a situation which precipitates his dismemberment and death. Thus, any translation of *Ba.* 471 should reflect that Pentheus is not simply asking what is the nature of the rites the Stranger was given by the god, but rather *how they appear before the eyes* (σοι) in all of their terrifying strangeness, a vision he intends to procure for himself, an obsession with visual gratification that he is powerless to restrain and which he will pursue through personal humiliation (the cross-dressing), to the disgrace and torment of his unwitting mother, and to his own premature end.

παράδειγμα

Another multifaceted term with both art critical and practical application, παράδειγμα shows up frequently in inscriptions and in literature to refer to various sorts of "models," especially in the service of architecture, but occasionally also for painters and sculptors.[117] The term makes two appearances in Euripides that are worth noting. At *El.* 1084–1085 Electra, in a tirade against her mother, points out that the conspicuously bad example set by Clytemnestra's own sister Helen should have made it easy for her (Clytemnestra) to be good, for the following reason: τὰ γὰρ κακὰ / παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐσθλοῖσιν εἴσοψίν τ' ἔχει ("for evil deeds proffer a spectacle that serves as a model for the good").[118] On the same principle, and through similar language, in fr. 644. 3 (*Polyeidos*), we hear that when a bad person prospers in the city, his example taints the minds of his betters: παράδειγμ' ἔχοντας τῶν κακῶν ἐξουσίαν ("having a model that is an authority for evil"). In both cases παράδειγμα is well-placed to stand in as an image for a comparison between good and evil that demands to be *seen*, that is, visually verified.

As Pollitt observes, the basic meaning of παράδειγμα (from παραδείκνυμι) is "show side by side"; hence, "model" or "pattern."[119] The term has a pedigree in the visual arts that stretches back at least to

---

[117] The literature is vast. For a convenient summary of the history and use of this well-documented technical term, see Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 204–215, with passage #'s 1–29; its numerous inscriptional appearances include the building accounts of the Erechtheum (*IG* I[3] 476. 258, 262, 342).

[118] Or as Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 79, translates: "for evil sets a standard for the good, and makes it conspicuous."

[119] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 211; the term also comes to mean "ideal" in Plato (Halliwell, "Plato and Painting," p. 129).

Herodotus' (5. 62) description of the Almaeonids' completion of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, although it likely had currency as a technical term for model, plan, or diagram long before it turns up in our sources. As a technical term it is by no means exclusive to the visual arts; παϱάδειγμα also has forensic application, denoting "evidence" or "proof," as in "showing by example," in which sense fourth-century orators adopt it as a rhetorical term. Thucydides enlists it to mean simply "proof" without any sense of "example," or any trace of a visual component.[120] That architects and artists borrowed the term from forensics seems less likely than the opposite line of transference, a pattern more typical of the dissemination of language associated with the visual arts, though this assumption must of course remain unproven. At any rate, in neither of the passages at stake is it clear whether Euripides intended his audience to picture an image or simply register a meaning. Paley suggests that παϱάδειγμα at *El.* 1084–1085 "is a rhetorical rather than a poetical word" and translates "induces comparison with and attention to the good."[121] However, in this case, there may be some slight supporting evidence that the term as used is borrowed from the visual arts rather than rhetoric: the presence of the *hapax* εἴσοψίν, "visible thing," a correction by Scaliger of the ms. εἰς ὄψιν, equally "to sight."[122] Taking also into consideration the demonstrable habit among Classical Greek authors to turn to the visual arts when seeking appropriate analogies for their abstract ideas—with Euripides being outstanding in this regard only among his fellow tragedians—I am inclined to conclude that his παϱαδείγματα are imported from the visual arts rather than the verbal.

τύπος

A singularly crucial artisinal term, whose parameters of technical application in the visual arts have yet to be fully understood despite generating one of the largest bodies of scholarly literature on any term in this category, puts in an impressive number appearances in the corpus of

---

120 Hornblower, *Thucydides*, p. 106, suggests that Thucydides' "strained use of an ordinary forensic term influenced, rather than was influenced by, rhetorical theory."

121 Paley² 2, p. 394.

122 Both Paley² 2, p. 394, and Denniston, *Euripides Electra*, p. 184, are somewhat puzzled by εἴσοψιν, which Denniston translates "the act of looking." LSJ *rev. suppl.*, s. v. replaces its earlier "spectacle" with "observation, attention."

Euripides. This is τύπος.[123] Because of its importance, Pollitt includes the term in his study of ancient art critical terminology even though, as the author acknowledges, "it never signifies a criterion by which the quality of a work of art is evaluated."[124] The interest of art historians and archaeologists runs high; a more complete understanding of the technical ramifications of this word and its cognates would no doubt allow greater access into certain aspects of ancient sculptural production, most specifically the use of models, than we now have. Nevertheless, as a technical term, τύπος remains mired in obscurity. As A.A. Donahue is forced to admit, "no appearance of the word in any source is without controversy."[125] Understanding is complicated by the fact that most of the literary appearances of τύπος tend rather to obfuscate than to clarify its technical applications. An overview of its appearances in Euripides will not break this impasse; however, there is light to be shed on the playwright's uses of the term, our main objective.

The length and complexity of the entry in LSJ testify as to how wide-ranging the ancient sources are in their use of the word. The preferred translations, "impression," or its opposite, "relief," which presume that its roots are to be located in τυπόω ('form by impress, mold') or τύπτω ('strike'), apply easily enough in many instances of its occurrence, as does simply 'sculpture' or 'statue'. However, a significant proportion of scholars have argued with varying degrees of success, based upon the contexts of several of the sources, that it should be interpreted as some sort of "model" or "maquette" instrumental in the *production* of sculpture, rather than to completed work, and therein lies the main reason for the inordinate amount of attention the term has received. τύπος does on occasion seem to indicate some sort of plastic template, not necessarily to be considered a model, which would then differentiate it from παράδειγμα, a term and concept with which it has an ambiguous relationship, which is more often to be thought of as a two-dimensional master plan, or, if plastic arts are at issue, a prototype.

The most significant (and notorious) testimonium for this use of τύπος is a building account for the early fourth-century temple of Asclepios at Epidauros, in which we are told that Timotheus (the name is the same as

[123] Still the most accessible and reliably judicious synthetic treatment of the term, including an assembly of the most important ancient sources, is Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 272–293; further references are cited below.

[124] Pollitt, *AVGA*, p. 272.

[125] A.A. Donohue, *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture* (Atlanta, GA, 1988), p. 22.

that of a major fourth-century sculptor who worked on the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus) "took up the contract to make (ἐργάσασθαι) and provide (παρέχε[ι]ν) τύπο[υ]ς" for 900 dr. (*IG* IV^2 [I] 102 A. 36–37). A number of theories have been proposed as to what these objects were, ranging from finished metopes on the temple (no trace of which has been found) or, as is more likely, some sort of preparatory models, templates, molds, or prototypes, intended as workable guides for a studio of sculptors with the object of insuring at least a minimal degree of uniformity of style even when, as was usual, multiple hands were at work on the sculptural program of a single building.[126] (Curiously, if merely coincidentally, anatomical votives dedicated to Asclepios are referred to as τύποι.[127]) To judge from my own evaluation of Euripides' uses of the word, I am inclined to follow Pollitt in concluding that "the preponderance of the evidence is *against* the interpretation of τύπος as 'model,'" per se.[128]

In the case of Euripides, however, there are a couple of potential exceptions that could either prove the rule, or change the picture entirely. The first would allow for a nuance of interpretation to run through all of the playwright's uses of the terms. In a brief discussion of the term in reference to the appearance of the verbal form at Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen*, 15 (τρόποις τυποῦται), Charles Segal points out that, in Democritus (DK 68B228), it occurs with "a metaphorical, ethical sense approaching 'character,'" and offers as a comparison the English term "stamp." Segal applies this to elucidate the Gorgias passage, where a reference to character is clearly intended,[129] but it might also be applicable to Euripides. A "model," in the sense of paradigm, of behavior could serve just as well as an analogy, or, as we say in English, "they broke the mold;" both would preserve the purest essence of the term's craft origins. If this is the case, then Euripides' fondness for τύπος would fit in well with his general interest in the representation of character, as discussed in Chapter Three.

---

126 For a review of the extensive literature on the interpretation of τύπος in this inscription, see Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 284–293.

127 Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon*, p. 236.

128 Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 288–292, with summaries of earlier scholarship. Some of the more significant: Gisela M.A. Richter, "ΤΥΠΟΣ and Timotheos," *American Journal of Archaeology* 31 (1927), 80–82; Albrecht von Blumenthal, "ΤΥΠΟΣ und ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ," *Hermes* 63 (1928), 391–414, based on a full linguistic study of the term; Georges Roux, "Sur quelques termes d'architecture: 1) ΞΥΛΩΜΑ 2) ΤΑΡΣΟΙ 3) ΤΥΛΩΣΙΣ 4) ΤΥΠΟΙ," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 80 (1956), 507–521 (518–521), and "Le sens de ΤΥΠΟΣ," *Revue des Études anciennes* 63 (1961), 5–14.

129 Charles P. Segal, "Gorgias and the Psychology of the Logos," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 66 (1962), 99–155 (142, n. 44).

The second is more specific to the interpretation of one passage, a relatively new papyrus fragment, 928a. 2–3 (Austin fr. 153). The subject is almost certainly Daidalos, "who first established altars of our heavenly divinities": εὐαγῆ τ' ἀγάλματα / γλ[υ]πτοῖσι τέχνης ζωοποιήσα[ς] τύποις ("and made lifelike sacred *agalmata* by means of the carved *typoi* of his craft"). Primavesi, who also accepts γλ[υ]πτοῖσι τύποις as an instrumental dative in his translation (Daidalos "*created as living creatures* his pious *dedications (agálmata)* by means of the sculpturally worked *typoi* of his art"), concludes nonetheless that these τύποι are equivalent to the ἀγάλματα and that therefore the fragment provides strong evidence that τύπος can indeed refer to sculpture-in-the-round.[130] However, I cannot accept this interpretation. It takes *five words in a row* (i.e., all but εὐαγῆ, which is solely descriptive) to get across the *artifactuality* of these artifacts. Included among them, τύποις as instrumental dative virtually begs to be identified as some sort of model, mold, template, or prototype, in other words, a tool of Daidalos' *craft* (τέχνης), not a reflection of his "art," in the modern sense, as Primavesi implies, that enabled the creation of the sacred images. Simply put, he made ἀγάλματα, by means of τύποι. The τύποι (tools of the sculptor's trade) made the ἀγάλματα possible.

With these intriguing possibilities as background, we now turn to the remaining Euripidean appearances of τύπος. Several are relatively straightforward in their intent. At *Rh.* 305 we have designs inlaid with gold (χρυσοκολλήτοις τύποις) decorating the πέλτη on the shoulders of Rhesus' horses, and at *Ph.* 1130, a repoussé motif adorning Capaneus' iron shield (σιδηρονώτοις δ' ἀσπίδος τύποις ἐπῆν / γίγας).[131] In both cases we may imagine designs that are either beaten out from (*Ph.* 1130)

---

[130] Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," pp. 195–196. On the other hand, Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 8, p. 521, do not translate with instrumental dative: "... and fashioned sacred lifelike images of them in artfully carved sculptures."

[131] At *Ph.* 1130 I follow Mastronarde, *Euripides Phoenissae*, in printing τύποις, which has mss. authority; Diggle, Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women*, and Kovacs, *Euripides*, 5, prefer κύκλοις; for discussion, see Mastronarde, op. cit., p. 467. I consider σιδηρονώτοις, with Mastronarde, to be better taken as a transferred epithet associated with ἀσπίδος. The entire catalog (*Ph.* 1104–1140) is suspected of interpolation; for recent discussion of the arguments for and against, see Mastronarde, op. cit., pp. 456–459, who, unlike Diggle, does not bracket the lines. Barbara Goff, "The Shields of *Phoenissae*," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 29 (1988), 135–152, argues for authenticity by presenting an extensive case for the ways in which the shield episode deliberately distances itself from its Aeschylean precedent, demonstrating an "emphatic and self-aware intertextuality" (p. 135).

or impressed into (*Rh.* 305) the surface; regarding the latter, we should probably think of niello technique, in which the cut-out forms are imbedded into a heated soft metal alloy which subsequently hardens, rather than true inlay, although either would suit equally well the techniques governed by τύπος. At *Hipp.* 862 Theseus sees the τύποι ("impressions") of a wax seal generated by the gold signet ring of his dead wife Phaedra on a letter she holds in her hand. Less straightforward are the two occurrences in *Trojan Women*. The χρυσέων τε ξοάνων τύποι of *Tr.* 1074 is exceptional, but not unparalleled, in that it appears to refer to statues in-the-round rather then reliefs.[132] As ξοάνον is used primarily of wooden images, these must be wooden statues that are either gilded or, more likely, covered with hammered gold plates, like primitive early versions of the chryselephantine statue.[133] In either case, but more so the latter, the sense of "relief" or "beaten" is preserved. There are extant examples of the statuary type that Euripides might have had in mind, although they are not in gold: These are the large seventh-century wooden cult images of Leto, Apollo, and Artemis from the temple of Apollo at Dreros, Crete, which are called by archaeologists "sphyrelata," because they are wrapped with hammered bronze, a Near Eastern technique.[134]

The term's second appearance in *Trojan Women* is even more resistant to easy translation. At *Tr.* 1196 Hecuba is directly addressing the shield of her son Hector on which now lies the torn body of her grandson Astyanax. She lovingly notes and mourns the physical signs of the dead man's long use of, and dependence upon, the shield, which, as a further symptom of its personification, is now pitied for being without a protector of its own. The visible signs of the shield's once illustrious ownership include an impression (τύπος) of Hector's manly shoulder on the leather shoulder strap, its stretched and molded form made stiff and permanent from dried sweat and heavy use (*Tr.* 1197–1199 mention the

[132] Cf. Blumenthal, "ΤΥΠΟΣ und ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ," p. 402. Tyrell, *The Troades of Euripides*, p. 107, and Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. 249, suggest that the whole line is a periphrasis for "statues of the gods;" cf. Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 386. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis*, p. 345, wonders whether E. was thinking of gold copies of older wooden images. Roux, "Le sens de ΤΥΠΟΣ," p. 7, rather implausibly holds out for some type of votive relief that depicts three-dimensional cult statues. While I am not convinced, I respect his attempt to preserve the proper technical sense of the term.

[133] *Pace* Donohue, *Xoana*, p. 22, in her discussion of the use of the term *xoanon* in fifth-century literature: "In this passage [*Tr.* 1074], the association of the word with architectural models and the like seems much less likely than with relief-work, and the phrase might be construed as 'reliefs of golden carved-work', or something similar."

[134] Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, p. 105 and pl. 17.

evidence of Hector's sweat on the shield).[135] This would be the famous "tower" or body shield used by Hector in the *Iliad* which he hangs over his shoulders by means of a telemon or baldric (*Il.* 16. 803) and reaches to his ankles; that this is how the shield is used is made clear when Hector slings the shield behind him and onto his back as he departs from the battlefield at *Il.* 6. 116–118. This type of shield does not appear to have had handles; hence, a common translation of πόρπαξ here must be abandoned.[136] Other interpretations of the passage do not take into account that the impressions are not in the body of the shield, which would have been constructed from multiple layers of thick cowhide, but rather in the thinner, more malleable baldric.[137] The use of τύπος with its range of technical meanings which include mold, repoussé, or any type of relief is well-suited to describe the convex, idiosyncratic, impression left over time by Hector's shoulders in the leather baldric dampened from sweat.

We have already encountered *Ph.* 161–162 (ὁρῶ δῆτ' οὐ σαφῶς, ὁρῶ δέ πως / μορφῆς τύπωμα στέρνα τ' ἐξεικασμένα) in an earlier chapter, where the passage was tentatively associated with contemporary developments in monumental painting. Now we may consider an alternative interpretation, which happens to have the advantage of cleaving more closely to the documented uses of τύπος and cognates in sculptural contexts, the general range of meaning to which most commentators on the passage have turned in their various interpretations. Pearson, for instance, suggests that the two images (μορφῆς τύπωμα and στέρνα ἐξεικασμένα) should be merged syntactically into one, translating "outlined semblance of his shape and bust."[138] Following Pearson's lead, the phrase could be treated as a true hendiadys. Translate: "I see what looks like the molded form of his breastplate." Antigone describes what she sees in terms of two separate aspects of her brother's coming into view, one of his body (μορφῆς τύπωμα) and one of the corselet that he wears (στέρνα ἐξεικασμένα). However, that it is actually *one* thing that leads to the identification—his gilded corselet or breastplate, probably with an emblem emblazoned on it, that conceals his torso—is reinforced when Antigone names the armor specifically at v. 168 (ὅπλοισι χρυσέοισιν), after she has been able to discern it more clearly.

[135] Cf. *Il.* 2. 388–389.
[136] Anthony M. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armor of the Greeks* (1967; repr. Baltimore and London, 1999), pp. 19–20. The tower shield in use appears on a niello dagger blade from the shaft graves at Mycenae (Marinatos and Hirmer, *Crete and Mycenae*, pls. 35–38).
[137] E.g., Pucci, "The Monument and the Sacrifice," p. 161.
[138] Pearson, *Euripides. The Phoenissae*, p. 88.

The present interpretation allows τύπωμα to fall into line with the other Euripidean uses of τύπος, that is, to refer to something molded, embossed (literally, in repoussé), or in relief, any of which would apply equally well to a gilded breastplate. To be fair, τύπος does appear elsewhere in Euripides to mean simply "form" with no obvious undertones of craft, as is the case at *Ba.* 1331 and *Heracl.* 858, the latter in a play which, significantly, does not feature artisinal language to any great extent. These two more or less exceptional instances in which Euripides uses τύπος non-technically to mean little more than "form" may owe something to the earliest preserved figurative or metaphorical use of the term by his younger contemporary, Democritus, who employs it, albeit with greater nuance, in a reference to children not fitting the "mold" of their parents, to their detriment (DK 68B228), mentioned above. However, the variant τύπωμα is more exclusively reserved for "beaten or molded (three-dimensional) thing," unlike the more generic and potentially abstract τύπος. Thus, to translate τύπωμα "outline" (as at LSJ, s. v.), adopting a term for what is essentially a two-dimensional formal quality, is to disregard this intrinsic meaning. Furthermore, a perfectly self-sufficient word for "form," μορφῆ, is present. It bears repeating that the proliferation of distinctively meaningful references (μορφῆς, τύπωμα, στέρνα, ἐξεικασμένα) strongly suggests that something more specific than "her brother's form" is intended by the collocation. Given the emphasis in this play on the physical spectacle of arms and armor, all the more so if vv. 1104–1140 are not interpolated, as is sometimes suspected, it should not be surprising that Antigone would single out her brother's armor as his most individualizing feature. It is again their *arms* which allow the seven to be isolated as individuals "from the heights of the citadel" (v. 1098) in the messenger's description of the battle.

Fr. 752c (*Hyps.*), in which someone is urged to look upwards at the decoration of a pediment of the temple of Zeus at Nemea, was introduced and treated at length in the previous chapter. The fragment, the only extant Euripidean use of τύπος in an architectural context, is also significant to the present discussion. Again: ἰδού, πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἐξαμίλλησαι κόρας / γραπτούς <τ' ἐν αἰετ>οῖσι πρόσβλεψον τύπους ("Look! Shift your eyes toward the sky and fix your gaze upon the painted [relief] sculptures in the pediments"). Primavesi has recently argued that the τύποι here are painted sculptures-in-the-round and not, as is more commonly assumed, some form of reliefs. He compares Euripides' fr. 928a, discussed above, along with *Tr.* 1074 (which are likely three-dimensional

xoana) and an unattibuted tragic fragment, formerly assigned to Sophocles (*TrGF* 2 [*Adesp.*] 618. 7).[139]

Earlier I argued that the two descriptive terms used of pedimental sculptures, γραπτούς and τύπους, together suggest that monumental figures in relief are meant rather than sculptures in-the-round, and that they may in fact have been painted. We noted that this mirrors the status of several of the unattributed Archaic pediments from the Athenian acropolis, which, in combination with their antiquity, render them appropriate visual comparanda for the intended Euripidean image. A survey of the uses of τύπος in Euripides has lent further support to the earlier conclusion. In all instances, with the possible exception of the more generalized usages at *Ba.* 1331 and *Heracl.* 858, and at *Tr.* 1074, where the referent appears to be a specialized category of statues-in-the-round, he is careful to respect and preserve the standard technical sense of the term. While we cannot know just how broad-based the usage of τύπος was in the studio, that its application was restricted to the merely practical may be judged by the fact that, in the hands of Greek and Latin writers, it is overwhelmingly a prosaic rather than a poetic word, to judge from the list of 98 testimonia collected by Pollitt.[140] Euripides' multiple uses of the term in its most securely attested sense confirm that he was aware of the differences between a fully carved statue and work in relief and deliberately chose language that would reflect the distinction.

κανών and στάθμη

It is often the case with technical terminology that, as it makes its way beyond the studio and assumes its place in the vernacular, it sacrifices much of its specificity and "color." The language of craft comes often to be used, or misused, as the case may be—for not every literary appropriator of this language respects its practical origins to the same degree as does Euripides—in a habitual way as a kind of standard or model against which other, completely unrelated matters may usefully be analogized or measured. In the next set of words to be considered, κανών and στάθμη, measurement itself becomes the standard. The two terms are not, in the strictest sense, art critical terms; in and of themselves they are not of concern to Pollitt in *The Ancient View of Greek Art*, with one conspicuous exception, the Canon of Polykleitos, to be addressed

[139] Primavesi, "Colorful Sculptures," pp. 195–196.
[140] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 272–284, to which add A. *Supp.* 282–283.

presently, which alone justifies their inclusion in the present section. With these two terms, sometimes used interchangeably, an oft recurring image for accurate, reliable measurement of all metaphorical and figural degrees and sorts can be said unequivocally to owe its origins to the craftsman's studio and to language associated with the mechanics of actual measuring and ruling. Before we turn to the Euripidean passages that incorporate this language, we must review in brief the technical background of the terminology in question.[141]

Two distinct devices for measuring or ruling on wood or stone are attested in antiquity: the rod and the line, the κανών and the στάθμη, respectively, in Greek. An actual example of the former is preserved, having been recovered in 1985 in a shipwreck of ca. 400 BC off the coast of central Israel; found along with a square (γνώμων), these are the earliest preserved Classical Greek measuring instruments.[142] No known example of the latter, understandably, has been identified. Between them, the two discrete devices appear to account for at least five, and probably more, methods of measuring, ruling, leveling, and aligning, methods which are still in use today:[143] (1) the chalk or "ruddled" line, so called because it is coated with red-ochre μίλτος,[144] used to rule on wood or stone and as a gauge for leveling, both horizontal and vertical, by snapping against the surface; (2) the string line used to align horizontally; (3) the plumb-line used to align vertically; (4) the rigid ruler or rod used for marking or measuring out straight edges of relatively short length, or dragged, coated with μίλτος, across a surface as a gauge for leveling; and (5) the measuring cord. Regarding the last, unruddled, the line may be used for the

[141] Parts of the following discussion have appeared in Mary Stieber, "Measuring True: κανών and στάθμη in Greek Poetry," in *Proceedings of the XIth Congress of the International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies* (Athens, 2002), pp. 897–909. Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, pp. 45–50 and 71–72, collects and comments on the ancient literary references to these tools.

[142] Robert R. Stieglitz, "Classical Greek Measures and the Builder's Instruments from the Ma'agan Mikhael Shipwreck," *American Journal of Archaeology* 110 (2006), 195–203; the κανών is illustr. in figs. 1 and 2. Stieglitz' article, which is mainly devoted to determining the standards of measurement indicated on the instruments, makes clear that multiple measuring devices were in use by builders in the fifth century BC.

[143] For the primary ancient sources, see Anastasios K. Orlandos and John. N. Travlos, Λεξικόν Ἀρχιτεκτονικῶν Ὅρων (Athens, 1986), s. vv., and below.

[144] References to μίλτος and to its technical applications turn up frequently in inscriptions: e.g., *IG* II^2 1672. 16, a fourth-century building inscription from Eleusis, and *IG* VII 3073. 103, 117, 123, 133, 136, a Hellenistic building contract from Lebadeia. The μιλτεῖον, the box containing the μίλτος in which the string is stored and drawn for use, is mentioned in an epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (Gow and Page 8, v. 3; *AP* 6. 205).

determination of a measurement that does not require a numerical equivalent, a practice that is still commonplace. Sometimes it is not only more practical but more exact to ascertain requisite dimensions by marking them with a string or on a piece of paper. Countless such situations arise in the course of building or constructing in wood or stone at all scales. In many cases, each measurement is generated in succession from the previous, dictated only by empirical requirements that do not lend themselves to precise numerical determination beforehand. Empirical measurement can be, paradoxically, more accurate than numerical measurement and requires no special mathematical skills of the craftsman. We would do well to keep this in mind as we review the literary appropriations of the two terms.

Note the distinction between *leveling* and *aligning* among the uses of these tools. To further complicate matters, still another distinct technical usage of κανών is for the heddle bar of a loom (e.g., *Il.* 23. 761), used, as explained by E.J.W. Barber, an experienced weaver, with the shed bar, to separate the strands of the warp so that the weft might be pulled through; these bars can be identified, according to Barber, on weaving scenes on Greek vases.[145] This meaning is not, however, attested in Euripides. In addition Robert D. Cromey points out that κανόνες may also be used for marking the four corners of a building as they are being squared with the aid of the στάθμη; according to the author, both devices are shown on a red-figure vase by the Penelope Painter (Louvre G372).[146] Senses one through three and five overlap in that they all involve a flexible as opposed to a rigid device and may be grouped together for the present purposes. And it is important to remember that, just as we use both "yardstick" or "ruler" and "straightedge" as a way of distinguishing by name two distinct and often separate uses for the same craftsman's tool, that is, the first for measuring and the second for ruling in the sense of drawing a straight line of either certain or uncertain measurement, so the ancient names κανών and στάθμη could be used of the same tools, but not necessarily for the same use. For non-artisan Greeks, it my have been conventional to pair the terms in order to encompass with one image all of the techniques of measuring and ruling—or perhaps they were unconcerned about the differences in common parlance; compare our own metaphorical uses of "yardstick" and "ruler."

---

[145] Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, p. 271.

[146] Cromey, "History and Image," p. 167, with pl. 5.

Both the κανών and the στάθμη are included among the measuring devices (μέτροις) and other tools (ὀργάνοις) used in the art of building (τεκτονικήν) for purposes of accuracy (πολλὴν ἀκρίβειαν) at Plato *Philebus* 56b–c, where Socrates, in reciting a list of five items, is careful to mention both, thereby acknowledging that the functions of the two are distinct. So too at Plutarch, *de fortuna* 99b–c, the two devices appear together in another itemized list of means by which accuracy is achieved in the arts, thereby leaving little opportunity for the accidents of chance to enter the process: κανόσι καὶ στάθμαις [or, alt., σταθμαῖς] καὶ μέτροις καὶ ἀριθμοῖς πανταχοῦ χρῶνται. In a Hellenistic epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (Gow and Page 8; *AP* 6. 205) that features a list of tools used by the carpenter Leontichus and dedicated in his old age to the goddess Athena, both στάθμαι (v. 3) and κανόνες (v. 4) are found, and each is individually coupled with μίλτος; note that both of these tools had specific functions which required the use of colored chalk. In a later epigram that directly imitates Leonidas', by Philip of Thessalonika (*AP* 6. 103),[147] μίλτος is associated with the κανών, but not with the στάθμη, which clearly here means "plumb line" (στάθμην ἰθυτενῆ μολιβαχθέα, v. 1).[148] Compare Aristotle, *de caelo* 296b24, where a heavy object is thrown forcibly upwards κατὰ στάθμην, which I suspect means "like a plumb line," but in the opposite direction.[149] The στάθμη appears in an abbreviated list of ruling devices at Theognis 805–806 (cf. 543–544) (West), which includes as well the τόρνος (here, "compass") and the γνώμων ("carpenter's square"), all of which are introduced as comparative paradigms for getting things straight (εὐθύτερον).

Two distinct uses of the στάθμη, the plumb line and the chalk line, respectively, are, it seems, alluded to in a comic fragment of unknown date (*PCG* 1, fr. 261 [Pseudepicharmeia]): πρὸς στάθμῃ πέτρον τίθεσθαι, μήτι πρὸς πέτρῳ στάθμην ("to put the stone to the line, not the line to the stone").[150] In its various technical usages κανών is documented on numerous occasions in building inscriptions, whereas στάθμη is not.[151]

---

147 A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 (Cambridge, Eng., 1965), p. 316.

148 Text: Paton, *The Greek Anthology*, 1.

149 For additional examples of στάθμη meaning "plumb line," see LSJ, s. v. ii.

150 The presence of στάθμη has been cited to justify the identification of the fragment as comic (*PCG* 1, p. 150, with references).

151 LSJ, s. v. Inscriptional occurrences of κανών include *IG* I^3 386. 113, of 408/7 BC, from Eleusis; multiple times in the Erechtheum accounts, e.g., *IG* I^3 474. 248; and *IG* VII 3073. 108, 122, 123, 143, a Hellenistic building contract from Lebadeia.

This could be significant. Ancient application of technical terminology was neither as rigid nor as consistent as modern usage, and should not be expected to be. Perhaps κανών was applied much more liberally than has been supposed to a variety of devices, both rigid and non-rigid, for measuring, ruling, aligning, leveling, and tracing. There is also the possibility that some migration of terminology toward κανών has occurred to avoid confusion with σταθμόν, a neuter noun meaning "weight." Some sort of weight was usually required to facilitate the use of the chalk, string, and plumb lines, the domain of the στάθμη, a detail that might account for its etymology. At any rate κανών, the term found in inscriptions, is preferred by Euripides, conforming to the pattern with which we have become familiar in this study. Herbert Oppel noticed that the "κανών der τέκτονες" appears for the first time simultaneously in Euripides and in building inscriptions from the late fifth century, whereas "der homerische τέκτων bedient sich nur der στάθμη."[152] It is as if Euripides were deliberately seeking out the most current artisanal vocabulary to suit his purposes, rather than taking the easy route of emulating earlier poets. That this is the case is reinforced by the example of Pindar, a poet who is equally fond of this imagery; κανών is not found, whereas there are multiple occurrences of στάθμα.

There is no doubt of the word's humble origins. κανών presents a clear instance of the Greeks' borrowing a specialized craftsman's term from older Near Eastern languages. It is derived from *canna*, the word for "reed" or cognate "cane," which, according to Burkert, "is current in the whole of the Mediterranean world." Both the Akkadian and the Hebrew languages, however, use their version of the word to refer to a measuring stick, a usage too idiosyncratic, as Burkert deduces, to imagine that the Greeks happened upon their own comparable usage by any means other than direct borrowing.[153] Akkadian also provides a perfect parallel for the distinction between the κανών and the στάθμη in Greek. The word *qanû*, like its derivative, κανών, denotes the "measuring rod"

[152] Herbert Oppel, *ΚΑΝΩΝ. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (Regula-Norma)* (Leipzig, 1937), p. 11, apparently unaware of the Sophoclean fragment discussed below, which does not, however, necessarily negate his claim. For the relevant inscriptions, see note 151, above. On Homer's use of the two terms, see further below.

[153] Walter Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution. Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, trans. Margaret E. Pinder and Walter Burkert (1992; repr. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1995), p. 38, with n. 21; cf. Oppel, *ΚΑΝΩΝ*, pp. 1–2; Barber, *Prehistoric Textiles*, p. 271: "The base word is attested as *qanû* 'reed, cane' in cuneiform [i.e., Akkadian] all the way back to the 3rd millennium."

(*CAD*, s. v., 5), while *aslu* refers to the "measuring cord" (*CAD*, s. v. A, 1).[154] The two devices are depicted together appropriately in the hand of Shamash, the god of justice, on the famous stele with the law code of Hammurabi in the Louvre, and elsewhere in ancient Near Eastern art. An inscribed cuneiform tablet, a letter in Old Babylonian, from Kisurra (Kienast #159) refers to both devices, as in the Greek examples cited above, demonstrating the distinctiveness of the two tools. There is thus no question that κανών in Greece has solid artisinal roots long before it acquires figurative or metaphorical connotations like "rule" or "model."[155] Moreover, as we shall see, even in its metaphorical senses it never strays far from its origin in multiple craft practices. Also worth remembering is the seemingly unrelated technical usage of κανών for the heddle bar of a loom, which has nothing to do with measuring or accuracy, but seems nonetheless to preserve the earliest attested meaning of the term as simply a bar or rod.

While it is obvious that they were easily distinguished in actual practice by those whose business it was to employ them properly, the uses of the two terms are often blurred in poetry, although κανών usually refers to the rigid rod or rule and στάθμη, to the line, ruddled or not. At times the ambiguity may even be consciously exploited. For instance Sophocles' fr. 474 (*Oinomaos*) (*TrGF* 4) pairs the terms in a simile that compares the glance between two lovers, Pelops and Hippodamia, with a craftsman's ruling or measuring:

> τοίαν Πέλοψ ἴυγγα θηρατηρίαν
> ἔρωτος, ἀστραπήν τιν' ὀμμάτων, ἔχει·
> ᾗ θάλπεται μὲν αὐτός, ἐξοπτᾷ δ' ἐμέ,
> ἴσον μετρῶν ὀφθαλμόν, ὥστε τέκτονος
> παρὰ στάθμην ἰόντος ὀρθοῦται κανών
>
> (Pelops maintains the sort of hunter's charm of love, some glance of the eyes, by which he himself is softened, and it heats me up, measuring eye to eye, just as the line of the craftsman [who is] walking [it out] is extended straight and true).

In this case, since the κανών itself "is being straightened" (ὀρθοῦται), it follows that there are two potential interpretations: Either (1) κανών be taken with figurative sense, meaning something like "measurement," while στάθμη is taken with literal, technical sense, referring to the chalk, string, or measuring line, or, more likely, (2) κανών be taken with literal,

---

[154] I thank Eduardo Escobar for help with the Akkadian terms.
[155] Cf. Borbein, "Polykleitos," p. 87, who cites as well Oppel, *ΚΑΝΩΝ*, pp. 48–50.

technical sense, the only possible meaning being then the line, which, unlike a ruler, can and must be straightened out for use. In sense (2) παρὰ στάθμην would function adverbially, as it does at Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1045, where it means something like "straight and true."[156] Sense (2) strikes me as more likely since it is the κανών, not the στάθμη, that is being compared to an ἀστραπή of the eyes;[157] therefore, a literal rather than a figurative or metaphorical sense might be expected of the subject of a simile. Hence, my translation: "just as the line of the craftsman [who is] walking [it out] is extended straight and true." Another plausible interpretation proposed by Cromey allows for the two devices to be used together. It is based on a secondary function of the architect's κανόνες, that is, as markers planted upright at the four corners of a building as they are being squared with the aid of the line. He translates: "... measuring his gaze level, as when the staff of the architect moving along his line is set erect." According to Cromey, both the four staff-like κανόνες and the στάθμη, together with its ball weights, are shown being wielded by two robed men for this purpose in the red-figure vase by the Penelope Painter mentioned above.[158]

Finally, the least likely interpretation is that κανών in the Sophocles fragment refers to the plumb line, that is, the line that is dropped from a height to ascertain whether or not a wall is perpendicular, although Pearson translates it as such. Perhaps confusing the practical application of the two, Pearson, however, seems to contradict his translation in his commentary, suggesting that "κανών is the ruddled string (or rule) ... and στάθμη the line to be drawn on the material."[159] Since lovers' glances are the inspiration for the comparison, a horizontal rather than a vertical line would seem more appropriate. I have dwelt at some length on

---

[156] Cf. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 2, p. 129: "absolutely straight"; Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 2, p. 474: "*ad amussim*, according to measure, quite exactly."

[157] I am not alone in being unconvinced by Jebb, as reported by Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 2, p. 129, that Hippodamia's glance is the στάθμη, while Pelops' is the κανών; see, e.g., the criticisms of Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, pp. 48–49. Müller's own solution, however, that the image is of a woodworker using the measuring cord (στάθμη) to ensure straightness in the process of *manufacturing* (herstellen) a ruler (κανών), though ingenious, seems a bit too rarified.

[158] Cromey, "History and Image," pp. 167–168, with n. 12 and pl. 5. This would seem to be what Lewis Campbell, *Sophocles*, 2 (Oxford, 1881), p. 523, has in mind: "With measured glances meeting mine, as the carpenter's rule is upright when he keeps the line." Cf. Gow and Page, *The Greek Anthology*, 2, p. 317, on S. fr. 474: "[it] seems to mean that the carpenter or builder checks the verticality of his rod with his plumb line before drawing his line."

[159] Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 2, p. 129.

this fragment because, whichever interpretation is accepted, the unavoidable conclusion is that Sophocles, in contrast with what we have come to expect from Euripides, in awkwardly juxtaposing two craft terms which in a technical sense ought not to be used together, since they constitute two different tools for measuring or ruling, demonstrates a lack of concern for preserving the full impact of the technical ramifications of the terms, as of their potential for generating a concrete image. In the end Pearson may be right to imply that the abstract idea of measurement is of foremost importance in the simile, observing that "the intention is to emphasize the exact correspondence of their passionate glances."[160] However, the craftsman's un-aided eye is often the *only* instrument of judgment and, as such, the most reliable, especially in cases of alignment.[161] It is Pelops who is in control; he is the τέκτων directing the running of the line, with his eye on the goal, while she, Hippodamia, is the willing recipient of the erotic charge of his glance, which melts them both.

When it comes to technical language, Sophocles appears to have preferred the proverbial. Sophocles' fr. 330 (*Kedalion*) (*TrGF* 4) invokes a comparison that includes a proverbial expression for "anything which is useless for a particular purpose" (as Pearson puts it) which draws its inspiration from the basic principle behind the ruddled line: τοῖς μὲν λόγοις τοῖς σοῖσιν οὐ τεκμαίρομαι, / οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ <'ν> λευκῷ λίθῳ λευκῇ στάθμῃ ("I do not judge by your words any more than by a whitened line on a white stone").[162] It is obvious that, for any lining device to be effective on any given material, a contrasting color must be used to mark the line where it is snapped. Plato, *Charmides* 154b8–9, makes use of the same, evidently well-worn proverb, but in abbreviated form, mentioning only the second part, λευκὴ στάθμη, which prompted a scholiast to Plato, in

[160] Pearson, ibid. Similarly, R. Ellis, "I. On the Fragments of Sophocles," *American Journal of Philology* (1881), 411–424 (420), seems to elide the two devices when he translates: "measuring a glance equal to my own, as a carpenter's rule is kept straight while he moves along the line [i.e., its line?]," explaining that "The line drawn from Pelops' eye to Hippodamia's is exactly parallel to that from hers to him." Measuring metaphors involving the κανών and the στάθμη may also be mixed in E. fr. 376 (*Eurystheus*) (quoted and discussed below), if Pierson's suggestion of σταθμήσαντ' is correct, as well as at *Hec.* 602, if Wakefield's emendation σταθμῶν for ms. μαθῶν is correct, both of which seem improbable, given E.'s usual clear segregation of the two terms and cognates.

[161] As confirmed by professional builder Crelli, cited above. Michelangelo famously claimed to have "compasses in the eyes" (Summers, *Michelangelo*, pp. 368–379).

[162] Quotation, Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 2, p. 11. For this and other references to the proverb, see Radt's (*TrGF* 4) collection of testimonia to fr. 330; Pearson, loc. cit., provides additional commentary.

order to clarify the use of the παροιμία in *Charmides*, to quote this fragment of Sophocles' *Kedalion* where the complete version of the proverb appears.

To turn to Euripides, whose numerous appropriations of κανών were notorious at the end of the fifth century, to judge from Aristophanes' having his character "Euripides" parody this tendency at *Ra*. 956: λεπτῶν τε κανόνων ἐσβολὰς ἐπῶν τε γωνιασμούς ("introductions of precise canons and squarings of words"). The real Euripides, somewhat uncharacteristically, does slip into the habit of conflating the functions of the two tools, occasionally assigning the tasks of the στάθμη to the κανών, the term he favors. An example is to hand at *Tr*. 6, when Poseidon refers to ὀρθοῖσιν κανόσιν as shorthand for the means by which he and Apollo erected the walls of Troy; the plumb, string, or chalk line, properly the domain of the στάθμη, is meant here. A more correct, though metaphorical, use of the term is to be found at *Suppl*. 650, where a shaft of light from the sun striking the ground is described as a κανὼν σαφής. Paley noted the potential for two levels of associative intent: Along with the obvious visual analogy of the sun's ray with the straightness of the carpenter's rule, there is also the implication that the sun "imparts correctness to the vision, and so prevents a mistaken aspect of things."[163] Collard speaks of sunlight that is "not only brilliant in its uninterrupted illumination of the scene, but also a sure guide to a clear and credible report."[164] The very reliability of the κανών, whether for measuring or for drawing a perfectly straight line, would seem to be the point of associating it with a relentless shaft of brilliant sunlight. We get a sense here of how κανών ("canon") came to acquire its most familiar metaphorical cast.

A paradox is then behind the γνώμης πονηροῖς κανόσιν ἀναμετρούμενος / τὸ σῶφρον ("measuring wisdom by the judgment of faulty rulers") of Euripides' *Electra* 52–53. The predetermined regularity of the κανών is its reason for being; for it to be imperfect, defective, or (literally) "base" in any way constitutes a bold hypallage, although in actual practice, with frequent usage, rulers and straightedges can become

---

[163] Paley[2] 1, p. 436, who quotes a passage from Milton's "Comus" which is thought to allude to this verse of E.'s: "... som gentle taper / Though a rush Candle from the wicker hole / Of som clay habitation visit us / With thy long levell'd rule of streaming light ..." (Scholarly Press rep. of the Nonesuch Press's *John Milton: Poems in English with Illustrations by William Blake* [London, 1926], p. 63).

[164] Collard, *Euripides Supplices*, pp. 279–280, who compares the light of the day bringing about the battle for which the Persians had been preparing at A. *Pers*. 386 ff.; κανών, however, does not occur in this passage. E. *Ion* 1516–1517 might also be compared.

physically compromised.[165] On the other hand the δικαίους κανόνας of fr. 303. 4 (*Bell.*) is redundant, and for the same reasoning that makes the idea of a "base" canon ironical. The rather obvious incongruity posed by the notion of an inaccurate ruler would seem to increase the likelihood that the "bent ruler" (τὸν κανόν' … τουτονὶ τὸν καμπύλον) at Aristophanes' *Birds* 1002 is a joke. Dunbar observes that, since a κανών was normally straight, a type of semi-circular protractor for measuring angles which might have inspired the reference could have existed under another name.[166] There need not, however, be an incongruity here. The type of device that Aristophanes has in mind would have more in common with a dressmaker's rule or a French curve and used for tracing or marking rather than measuring but in principle could yet qualify as a κανών. Alternatively, Wycherley's suggestion that it is a carpenter's or mason's square, a device that could certainly justify the modifier "bent," at least from a visual point of view, is also plausible.[167] However, the idea of a flexible rather than a fixed ruler is to me the most appealing one. Such a device could conceivably be used to measure or trace the "shape" of the air (τὴν ἰδέαν, *Av.* 1000), which is the essence of the joke. Aristotle (*EN* 1137b29–33) mentions a μολίβδινος κανών ("lead ruler") "of Lesbian building practice" which is "indefinite" (ἀόριστος), that is, non-rigid, and therefore appropriate for measuring or tracing "the indefinite" (τοῦ ἀορίστου), for example, as has been suggested, the double-curved contours of a Lesbian cyma or so-called cyma reversa, a common type of molding which features both a concave and a convex curved element. It seems likely that the lead material allowed this rule to be pliable and therefore suitable for measuring or tracing curves.[168] However, before we

165 Apparently not willing to entertain the possibility of the oxymoron, Musgrave proposed πονηρᾶς for πονηροῖς. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 2, p. 129, commenting on S. fr. 474, discussed above, notes the following: "Purser in *Dict. Ant.* I 354a [a source I was unable to locate] takes a different view: 'the carpenter used to correct errors in the κανών by the aid of his eye and the στάθμη.' This is as if the κανών itself needed adjustment,—a contradiction in terms." Pearson cites D. Chr. 62. 7, who, remarking on the unlikelihood of an unjust king, draws this comparison: οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ κανὼν σκολιὸς καὶ ἄνισος ἄλλου προσδεόμενος κανόνος.

166 Dunbar, *Aristophanes Birds*, p. 556.

167 R.E. Wycherley, "Aristophanes, *Birds*, 995–1009," *Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937), 22–31 (25–26, with fig. 2).

168 Cf. H. Rackham, *Aristotle. The Nicomachean Ethics* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1926), p. 317, who suggests that the device referred to by Aristotle was used either for polygonal masonry or for the Lesbian type of molding, "which had a double curve." The former is less likely but not impossible: Lawrence/Tomlinson, p. 167, with fig. 273, illustrates and discusses the masonry style which is called Lesbian on account of "its

attribute too much logic to Meton's comic demonstration of mapping the air in *Birds*, it is well to remember Peisetairos' answer (οὐ μανθάνω, v. 1003) to Meton's rhetorical μανθάνεις, when he was halfway through it. The array of tools and devices on display as κανόνες ἀέρος (v. 999) need not have included anything which could plausibly do the job.[169]

In a passage discussed at some length earlier, noteworthy for its impressive array of technical language, Heracles threatens to destroy the Cyclopean walls of Mycenae, a symptom of his madness.[170] At *HF* 945 the chalk line or ruddled bar (here, κανών) is mentioned together with the mason's hammer (τύκος), with τύκοις and φοίνικι κανόνι serving in a kind of metonymic way to affirm the meticulous means by which the colossal ashlar masonry fortifications were constructed. The series of tools with which Heracles intends to undo the work of the builders of the walls, which includes axes, levers, and bars, may thus be viewed as a dastardly foil to the tools of the σοφοί masons, the τύκος and the φοίνικι κανόνι, one reason why the latter are worth mentioning in this context.[171] In a familiar pattern τύκος (alt. τύχος) is a term that is found in inscriptions, a handful of later writers, and this once in Euripides.[172]

We encounter virtually the identical language when the chorus at *Tr.* 814 refer to the walls of Troy as κανόνων δὲ τυκίσματα Φοίβου ("chiselings of Phoebus' ruddled lines [or bars]"), walls which were in fact destroyed by Heracles after Laomedon refused him the promised gift of horses. Barlow, noticing that the language of *Tr.* 814 is "rare," explains that it "draws attention to the chiseling marks made by Apollo's measuring line

---

prevalence in the fortifications of Lesbos." In this type of polygonal masonry, "the blocks were cut with curved outlines and fitted together like a jigsaw puzzle." On the Lesbian cyma or cyma reversa, see Lawrence/Tomlinson, pp. 72, with fig. 98, and 92–93.

[169] Cf. Oppel, *ΚΑΝΩΝ*, p. 13: "er [Aristophanes] meint überhaupt kein wirklich bestehendes Instrument."

[170] See Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 309–310, for a summary of the stereotypical symptoms of Heracles' madness; cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 205–206.

[171] Cf. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 312: "Heracles dwells on the careful construction of Mycenae, because he is going to demolish it; the implements of construction and destruction balance each other."

[172] LSJ, s. v.; cf. *TLG*. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 312, prefers τύχοις, following Maas, although he prints Diggle's text; a ms. of *HF* has τύχαις, which lacks sense. Inscriptional appearances include *IG* 11(2) 161 A. 87, 199, a third-century building inscription from Delos. Cf. E.'s use of τυκίσματα, discussed below.

on the great walls [?]."[173] However, it is more likely a condensed allusion to a lengthy and laborious process, an essential part of the highly skilled craft of ashlar masonry, that is, chiseling down the high areas marked by the chalk line or bar until a uniformly flat surface is achieved. It is interesting that φοίνικι also makes a delayed appearance, this time, as a modifier for πνοᾷ, the "blast" of fire (v. 815) which will destroy the walls, in what is quite possibly intended as an ironic reminder of the ruddling required for proper use of the κανών in building walls (note use #4, above). As Barlow notes, τυκίσματα "is found only in Euripides,"[174] and occurs again at *HF* 1096, where λαΐνῳ τυκίσματι are the chiseled drum(s) of the column to which Heracles is tethered, the same one against which he had fallen at v. 1006.[175] The identical expression appears in the genitive plural at fr. 125. 3 (*Andromeda*), where it describes a young woman who is mistaken for a statue naturally "chiseled" out of the living rock.[176] (As for λάϊνος Euripides' fondness for that [Homeric] adjective was noticed in his own time; it too is parodied by Aristophanes at *Ach.* 449 when he has his character Euripides speak of λαΐνων σταθμῶν.[177]) It is perhaps not

---

[173] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 32; the atypically awkward phraseology is perhaps owed to a slight misreading of Paley[2] 1, p. 522: "the chisellings after the plumb-line of Phoebus," which neatly captures the meaning. Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 310, translates "Fügungen."

[174] Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 141, n. 59: "The scribes missed this rare word." A *TLG* search turned up two additional sources, which could well be dependent upon E.: Lyc., *Alexandra* 349, and an epigram that mocks Lycophon for his use of this and other such recherché terms (Anthologiae Graecae Appendix, Ep. irr. 50. 3, *TLG*). τυκίσματα at *Tr.* 814 is the correction of Musurus; the mss. have variant readings. As Barlow, loc. cit., notes: "The text of these lines is fraught with difficulty."

[175] Variant readings and the problems associated with them are reviewed by Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, pp. 345–346, who also prints Diggle's text; cf. Barlow, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 171.

[176] There too, however, the text is not without problems; the critical history of the term in fr. 125. 3 is discussed below. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 345, notes the "remarkable link" between the language of this fragment (which includes a boat simile) and *HF* 1096, calling the phrase λάϊνον τύκισμα which (in different numbers and cases) is common to both "a precious expression for 'chiseled stone'." He concludes that it is more effective in *Andromeda*.

[177] Additional appearances of forms of λάινος include *Hel.* 962; *El.* 1150; *Tr.* 5, 540, 1088, 1141; *HF* 979, 1037, 1096, 1332; *IT* 997; *IA* 774; *Ph.* 797; *Ba.* 591; fr. 370. 91 (*Erec.*). Lee, *Euripides Ion*, p. 182, counts 18 occurrences in E., none in A., and one in S.W.J.M. Starkie, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (Amsterdam, 1968), p. 97, believes that *Ach.* 449 is taken in part from E.'s *Tel.* Cropp in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, pp. 18–19, who cites numerous instances of Aristophanes' incidental mocking of E.'s *Tel.* for, among other things, "its outrageous introduction of a prince masquerading as a beggar," observes that Aristophanes twice parodied the play extensively: *Ach.* 204–625 and *Th.* 466–764.

incidental that, in two Euripidean plays in which architecture is featured prominently in the plot, *Heracles* and *Trojan Women*, we find κανών deployed in its truest sense, as an indispensable mason's tool, without a trace of metaphor.

Fr. 376 (*Eurystheus*) is somewhat difficult of translation: οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτῳ χρὴ κανόνι τὰς βροτῶν τύχας / ὀρθῶς ἀθρήσαντ' εἰδέναι τὸ δραστέον ("I do not know by which canon it is necessary for one having observed properly the fates of mortals to know what is to be done"). In their respective editions, both Kannicht and Collard and Cropp[178] print ἀθρήσαντ', following the mss. However, σταθμήσαντ', proposed by Pierson, has also had strong advocates, including Nauck,[179] which would then create a kind of mixed metaphor. μετρήσαντ' has also been conjectured. The inclusion of some sort of verb connoting measurement in preference to the colorless ἀθρέω is appealing in this context. However, given Euripides' general propensity to respect the technical distinctions between the two measuring terms (admittedly not foolproof), σταθμάω may be the least preferable. In the end I am of mixed mind; at any rate, none of these terms significantly alters the meaning of the fragment.

The single appearance of στάθμη in Euripides at *Ion* 1514 has also proved difficult of interpretation; it is certainly metaphorical. Ion recoils with shock and disgust upon realizing that he almost became the murderer of his own mother, owing to a case of a mistaken identity. The expression παρ' οἵαν ἤλθομεν στάθμην βίου is used to characterize the extremity of the place or position to which Ion has come, figuratively speaking, in unwittingly contemplating and nearly carrying out the impious act of matricide. For "παρὰ στάθμην" Paley suggests two possible senses: '"beside (deviating from) the plumb-line,' and 'by (or true to) it.'"[180] However, both of these appear to neglect the notion of degree, kind, or level implied by the relative adjective οἵαν, which the comparanda Paley cites do not have. Verrall assumes that the addition of βίου ensures that στάθμην is used "figuratively."[181] In our discussion of the practical technical meanings of στάθμη and its relationship with κανών we saw that, while each has its distinct identity and application in the real world of measuring and ruling, distinctions that are often preserved in prose,

---

178 Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7.

179 Cf. Kannicht's app., *TrGF* 5, ad. loc. In defense of his reading, Kannicht brings a number of Euripidean and other comparanda to the case for ἀθρέω in similar contexts.

180 Paley^2 2, p. 109.

181 Verrall, *The Ion of Euripides*, p. 121.

in poetry they can and do overlap. The preposition παρά could indicate one of two things in this context: "beside"[182] or "contrary to." In the former sense the plumb-line might be better suited to the analogy being made, and the overall meaning of the metaphor might be something like "to what depths of depravity have I dropped." If the latter interpretation of the preposition is preferred, the carpenter's or mason's ruler might be better (where κανών might, in fact, be more appropriate, but compare S. fr. 474, above), or else the string line, in either case, giving the sense of "how greatly have I deviated from the straight and narrow."[183]

Euripides uses the verbal form, σταθμάω ("measure") at *Ion* 1137, as Ion sets about constructing the festival tent: πλέθρου σταθμήσας μῆκος εἰς εὐγωνίαν ("after having measured out a length of 100 ft. toward the end of squaring the corners"), a problematic passage, as we have seen, which likely refers to the establishment of one side of an intended rectangular area, the first step in the process of achieving the requisite four precise 90-degree angles. Sophocles also uses σταθμᾶσθαι figuratively at *OT* 1110–1112: εἰ χρή τι κἀμὲ μὴ συναλλάξαντά πω, / πρέσβεις, σταθμᾶσθαι, τὸν βοτῆρ᾽ ὁρᾶν δοκῶ, / ὅνπερ πάλαι ζητοῦμεν ("If it were necessary even for me who has never had dealings with him, elders, to size him up somehow, I would think that I see the herdsman, the very one whom we have long been seeking"), where the English expression "size up" I think captures the force of σταθμᾶσθαι better than LSJ's "conjecture," the preferred translation.[184]

A particularly intriguing metaphorical application allows our examination of κανών and στάθμη in Euripides to end on a speculative note. At *Hec.* 601–602 κανόνι τοῦ καλοῦ is mentioned by Hecuba as the means by which one is able to know what is evil, shameful, or ugly: τοῦτο

---

[182] Cf. Thgn. 543.

[183] Owen, *Euripides Ion*, p. 174, is of the same position, comparing *Heracl.* 295–296 (παρὰ μικρόν) and *IT* 870–871 (παρὰ … ὀλίγον). Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Ion*, p. 157, citing comparanda, suggests: "Es ist also die vorgeschriebene Bahn; die Infinitive [φονεῦσαι καὶ παθεῖν, *Ion* 1515] geben das Ziel." Dietram Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache. Die sprachlichen Bilder aus dem Bereich des Handwerks in der griechischen Literature bis 400 v. Chr.* (Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie), 51 (Meisenheim am Glan, 1974), p. 45, prefers the ruddled line. There is a another possibility altogether, that the analogy is with the race-course, as noted but not necessarily preferred by Owen, loc. cit., citing earlier commentators. This is not unlikely; life/race metaphors are extremely common.

[184] LSJ, s. v. ii, 2; Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, p. 46. Dawe, *Sophocles Oedipus Rex*, p. 168, however, is closer to the essence of the image: "to make calculations based on measurement."

δ' ἥν τις εὖ μάθῃ, / οἶδεν τό γ' αἰσχρὸν κανόνι τοῦ καλοῦ μαθών ("If someone learns this [i.e., goodness] well, then he knows the shameful, having learned it by means of the canon of the good").[185] The sense is unproblematic. Paley associates the idea behind these lines with Aristotle's notion that learning about τὸ καλόν is enough to educate one also about its opposite, since one has then a standard by which to compare.[186] Such ideas are expressed, for example, in *EN* 1101b30–32 and, in Euripides, at *El.* 1084–1085, discussed above. Certainly it would be hard to disagree with Gregory's concise assessment: "From the outset of the play Hecuba functions as a kind of measuring rod for sheer unhappiness, a standard against which to measure the plight of others."[187] However, while there is no justification for translating the substantive τοῦ καλοῦ as anything other than "good" as opposed to "evil" in this context, it is possible to infer as well a polysemic contrast between "beautiful" and "ugly," since the concepts "beautiful" and "good," as well as their opposites, are never far apart in Greek thought. With this in mind I wonder whether the expression κανόνι τοῦ καλοῦ was meant to prompt the alert reader and listener to think of the works of Polykleitos, the great fifth-century Argive sculptor, for which this language bears a unique significance.[188] While the gesture might at first seem out of place and merely gratuitous in a tragedy of such dimensions, Euripides is known on occasion to allow unexpected comic elements or other extra-dramatic "trivia" to intrude into even his most tragic dramas. He was, according to most reports, a learned man, and was not above dropping hints thereof.

As it happens, the word κανών is one of the most highly charged in the vocabulary of ancient art history and art criticism. I am referring to the "Canon of Polykleitos," the precise identification and content of which have been debated for as long as the life, reputation, and work of this important and influential sculptor have been studied.[189] Both Pliny (34. 55) and Galen (*de plac.* 5; *de temp.* 1.9, et al.) refer to Polykleitos' Canon,

---

[185] The lines in which the phrase is embedded are bracketed by both Diggle and Collard, *Euripides Hecuba*, but not by Murray, *Euripidis Fabulae*, 1. Kovacs, *Euripides*, 2, who also brackets the lines, prints Wakefield's emendation σταθμῶν for ms. μαθών.

[186] Paley^2 2, p. 553.

[187] Gregory, *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*, p. 112.

[188] Pauer, *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*, p. 71, also briefly makes the connection.

[189] Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 14–22 and passim, focuses extensively on the topic. For recent reappraisals of the subject and its ramifications, both ancient and modern, see Borbein, "Polykleitos;" Ernst Berger, *Der Entwurf des Künstlers. Bildhauerkanon in der Antike und Neuzeit* (Basel, 1992); and the collections of essays in D. Kreikenbom, ed., *Polyklet. Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik* (Mainz am Rhein, 1990) and Moon, *Polykleitos*.

the latter stating explicitly that there was both a treatise on proportion which was known as the "Canon" and a statue that exemplified the theory put into practice.[190] Scholars, for the most part, are in agreement that the ancient sources affirm that the same term was used both for the treatise and for the statue, the "Doryphoros," which is known from multiple copies.[191] However, the most interesting aspect of this state of affairs, what exactly the theory consisted of, has thus far escaped scholarly consensus. Galen, as Pollitt notes, seems to imply that achieving τὸ κάλλος was the goal of Polykleitos' system of συμμετρία: "Whether he [that is, Galen] is quoting a word used by Polyclitus or whether κάλλος is his own substitute for Polyclitus' τὸ εὖ is, however, impossible to say."[192] The adverbial substantive τὸ εὖ is purported to be Polykleitos' own formulation, as it comes down in an oft-quoted fragment, whose cryptic wording has never been satisfactorily explained: τὸ εὖ παρὰ μικρὸν διὰ πολλῶν ἀριθμῶν γίνεται ("beauty/perfection comes about little by little through many numbers").[193] Though uncommon, τὸ εὖ does appear in Euripides.[194] At fr. 285. 16 (*Bell.*) Bellerophon is ruminating on his own misfortunes and the misfortunes of men in general; he observes that the

---

190 The most complete recent compilation, with translations, of the ancient sources for Polykleitos is Norbert Kaiser, "Schriftquellen zu Polyklet," in Kreikenbom, *Polyklet*, pp. 48–78; for a convenient assembly of the sources relevant to art criticism, see Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 75–79.

191 Galen, *de Plac.* 5, is very clear that they are both called "Canon;" Quintilian, *Inst.* 5. 12. 21, implies the same; for these and additional sources for the Canon, see Kaiser, "Schriftquellen," nos. 38, 86–93; Pollitt, *Sources and Documents*, pp. 76–77. Pliny 34. 55 is somewhat confusing, since he appears to name the "Doryphorus" and the "Canon" as if they were separate statues, probably because he was consulting two different sources; Pliny also alludes to the treatise. The most well-known copy of the Doryphorus is in Naples, illustr. in Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, fig. 378. On the treatise, see, recently, Hanna Philipp, "Zu Polyklets Schrift 'Kanon,'" in Kreikenbom, *Polyklet*, pp. 135–155; on the statue, Ernst Berger, "Zum Kanon des Polyklet," and Hans von Steuben, "Der Doryphoros (Kat. 41–58)," op. cit., pp. 156–198.

192 Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 193–194; on τὸ εὖ, Pollitt, op. cit., pp. 15, 20 and 88, n. 6; Philipp, "Zu Polyklets Schrift 'Kanon,'" pp. 142–143.

193 DK 40B2; for discussion, see Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 14–22; Philipp, "Zu Polyklets Schrift 'Kanon,'" pp. 137–142.

194 Cf. Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 88–89, n. 6, who suspects that the phrase is Pythagorean; if so, this could account for its appearances at A. *Ag.* 121 and 349. While its appearances in E. cannot be exclusively connected with Polykleitos, all occurrences of τὸ εὖ may not be equivalent: Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, 2, p. 74, regards it in A. as "a substantival use not of the adverb but of the old adjective, of which the masculine form survives in the Homeric ἐύς." If Fraenkel is correct, then it is not out of the question that E.'s τὸ εὖ is adverbial rather than adjectival, and is in fact owed to Polykleitos, assuming that the latter's is also adverbial.

least of men is fortunate in one thing: That he does not know that he is bereft of "well-being" (τοῦ γὰρ εὖ τητώμενος / οὐκ οἶδεν). And again at *HF* 694–695, lines uttered by the chorus: τὸ γὰρ εὖ / τοῖς ὕμνοισιν ὑπάρχει ("For that which is noble and good is in my hymns").

While beauty was clearly its primary goal, the Canon of Polykleitos was as much a practical technical facilitator for sculptors as it was an account of Polykleitos' ideas on perfect proportions. That is to say it embodied the "how" as much as the "why" of the most admired male physical demeanor, on display in the "Doryphorus," which never left the sculptor's studio, yet was copied dozens of times and imitated in numbers that cannot begin to be calculated. Taking the full measure of this statue would have involved deploying several of the devices covered by the two terms under present consideration, as well as craftsman's σοφός fueled by a keen and highly trained eye with a sensitivity to "the seemly" (τὸ εὖ). The Polykleiton ideal was to hold sway until Lysippos of Sikyon attempted to improve upon it in the fourth century BC (Pliny 34. 61–65). During the time in which Euripides wrote his plays, it was the prevailing standard of beauty of the day, perhaps in life as much as in art, affecting representations of males as well as females in both two- and three-dimensional media in all categories and scales, major and minor, in the finest work and in the least prepossessing. Judging from what we have observed of his habits in appropriating the language of craftsmanship in a manner as faithful as possible to the original technical application, it is not out of the question that Euripides, with κανόνι τοῦ καλοῦ at *Hec.* 602, means to allude to the most renowned formulation of beauty in a work of visual art in the second half of the fifth-century, both in concrete and abstract terms.

With this tantalizing possibility in mind, it is more than curious that στάθμη, covering similar functions to κανών in Euripides, is the preferred term of the other two poets who favor this category of imagery: Homer (e.g., *Il.* 15. 410–411; *Od.* 5. 245, 21. 44, 121) and Pindar (e.g., *N.* 6. 7; *P.* 1. 62, 2. 90–91, 6. 45). Homer uses κανών only rarely, once for "heddle bar" (*Il.* 23. 761) and twice for the stretchers of a hide shield (*Il.* 8. 193, 13. 407), neither of which has anything to do with measuring and aligning, and both of which, as to be expected, adhere closely to the remotest origins of the word, following Burkert. Pindar, as noted above, does not use the term at all. Neither of these poets would have known about the Canon of Polykleitos; by the time it was formulated and popularized, Pindar's career was over, if not his life. It is just possible that Euripides' preference for κανών over στάθμη, in spite of the technical

inaccuracies which its use posed for a writer more accustomed to precision in his deployment of artisanal language and imagery, is owed to the term's sudden co-option as a major art critical term in the third quarter of the fifth century. Euripides, a reputed bookworm, might even have read the treatise, a somewhat more likely source than the statue for his acquaintance with the term.[195] Seen in this light, the fact that literature of the period contains a rather surprising number of appearances of two words for craftsmen's tools, κανών and στάθμη, with a substantial proportion of them concentrated in the extant corpus of Euripides, may be significant in a broader sense. That the very technical devices which permitted the craftsman accurate ruling and measuring, which at the time included the ultimate "Canon," the Polykleiton "Doryphorus," provided a perfect analogy for the "measuring" of abstract concepts, including matters of aesthetics and morality, suggests a preoccupation with the desirability of identifying reliable standards of measure for all things, physical, visual, and conceptual, in life as in art.[196] The natural place to look for terminology suitable for expressing these standards was, yet again, the milieu of the artisan, which has a history far older than that of the studio of the master sculptor. In this rare instance we can assume that the master sculptor turned to the same source as the master dramatist for the most effective language to suit the purpose.

μίμημα and μιμέομαι

Unlike the vast majority of the language we have considered thus far, the next set of words, μίμημα and μιμέομαι, do not owe their origination to the visual arts. However, by Euripides' day, the association of this word group with the representational arts, the visual in particular, is intimate, and would grow even more exclusive over the next century.[197] Consequently, more often then not, when these words appear in Euripides' plays, there is a high degree of likelihood of visual allusion or image. True, this is not a hard and fast rule: Exceptions include the μιμήματα at *IT* 294 and *IA* 578, which clearly refer only to imitations of sounds,

---

[195] E. is included among those celebrated for their large libraries at Ath. 1. 3a; the poet is made to seem ridiculous for using books at Ar. *Ra*. 943.

[196] Cf. Felix Heinimann, "Mass—Gewicht—Zahl," *Museum Helveticum* 32 (1975), 183–196.

[197] The subject of "imitation" in ancient Greek art and thought is as immense as the scholarly bibliography that it has inspired. In my view the best and most thorough recent study, with a full account of earlier bibliography, is Halliwell, *The Aesthetics of Mimesis*.

respectively, animals noises taken for the voices of the Erinyes, and the sound of Paris' rustic syrinx taken for the Phrygian aulos of Olympus. Moreover, because the business of mimesis and its language is shared by both the theatrical and the visual arts in the classical era, distinguishing between them when searching for the intended allusion often involves walking a fine line. All in all, however, Euripides' uses of this language are worth reviewing if only because of their number. As William Allan has written: "Eur. is the only poet to use μίμημα (eight times …), a word used frequently by Plato of various (counterfeit) images, including artistic and musical representations."[198] The preponderance of words of the μιμ-category and related imagery reinforces the conclusion that Euripides, above and beyond any of his peers, was fascinated with the very idea of imitation, the concept and the mechanics of it as well as the multiple ironies it involved.

Those instances in which Euripides uses this word group to refer, not without irony, to the imitation of character and behavior, both good and bad, would be only marginally relevant to our subject but for the fact that Euripides concerned himself greatly with the "representation" of character, as we saw in Chapter Three. In these cases, I prefer to translate "imitate" rather than "emulate" in order to preserve some trace of the connection to the visual arts that I believe is essential. One such case is *HF* 294, where Megara uses μίμημ' ἀνδρός to refer to the example set by the bravery of her husband, Heracles, in the face of death, which, under the present circumstances, she (and by implication, Amphitryon) might be expected to imitate (= emulate). The verb μιμέομαι is used at *Ion* 451 of those who imitate the example of the gods. Helen implores Theonoe to "imitate" the ways of her just father at *Hel.* 940. Clytemnestra explains how a scorned wife might choose to "imitate" the model established by her philandering husband and take a lover of her own at *El.* 1037. And at *Hipp.* 114 the pious old man declares to Aphrodite's image that there must be no imitating (μιμητέον) the disrespectful behavior shown by the young Hippolytos toward that goddess. These passages reveal nothing in particular about Euripides' attitude toward the visual arts, and they may in fact be regarded as linguistically neutral, if one so chooses, but they do, in their quantity, suggest that he wanted his audiences to be aware that the act of mimesis, examples of which were in evidence among the group of actors currently before their eyes, were as integral to life as to art.

---

[198] Allan, *Euripides Helen*, p. 244, ad loc. *Hel.* 875.

Other occasions for these terms are more directly visual in their frame of reference, if not necessarily meant to evoke art or art making. Dolon describes (and very likely demonstrates) how he shall "imitate" the four-footed stealth of a wolf at *Rh.* 211, granted that this form of imitation has more to do with the theater than with the visual arts. At *Ion* 1429 snakes adorning a golden necklace, one of the tokens of his infancy that are preserved in the basket that Ion holds, are called μιμήματα of Erechthonios, clearly a reference to works of minor art. These are relatively straightforward of interpretation. Trickier is *HF* 992 where Heracles in the act of clubbing one of his sons to death is assimilated to a μυδροκτύπον μίμημ' ("the very image of smiting iron"). Commentators have suggested that this is a bold version of μίμημα μυδροκτύποῦντος, with Bond noting that "the substance of the image compared is turned into an adjective."[199] Such boldness could be attributed to an interest on Euripides' part in emphasizing the idea of a μίμημα over the content of the image itself, since Heracles in his present condition is not at all himself; a counterfeit has taken his place. In another variation on the standard format of the simile Heracles will "faithfully match himself to" (ἐκμιμέομαι) the *visual* image of Ixion bound to the wheel at *HF* 1298.

Paris/Alexandros is called a δαλοῦ πικρὸν μίμημ' ("bitter replica of a torch") by a scornful Helen at *Tr.* 922. This is a direct reference to imagery from Hecuba's dream, while she was pregnant with him, that she gave birth to a torch, a story that was featured in the prologue of Euripides' lost *Alexandros.*[200] Helen herself is called a γυναικὸς εἰκὼ φόνιον and a μίμημ' Ἑλένης by Teucer at *Hel.* 73–75, in this case, with deliberate irony, although Teucer himself is unaware of it; the language serves as a double reminder to the audience that, although she is the real Helen, an actual counterfeit image of her—called a μίμημα instead of the usual εἴδωλον at *Hel.* 875—went to Troy and caused all the destruction. A similar play on the idea of imitating imitations is suggested by ὀνείρων μιμήματα ("imitations of dreams") of fr. 25. 3 (*Aiolos*), and by Zeus' θηρὸς κακούργου σχήματ' ἐκμιμούμενον ("imitating the motions of an evil beast") at fr. 210. 2 (*Antiope*). The elusiveness and ultimate uselessness of imitative substitutes is apparent when, in a tender image that brings home her double loss, Hecuba seizes upon one last mimetic token of the physicality of her beloved son when she notices

[199] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 318; cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, pp. 215–216, Barlow; *Euripides Heracles*, p. 168.
[200] Lee, *Euripides Troades*, p. xi.

that Astyanax' limp hands are the sweet images (εἰκούς) of his father (*Tr.* 1178–1179).[201] Yet it is only a momentary visual consolation, for her eyes shall soon be deprived of even this memory.

Wonderworking

In antiquity the activities of the artisan drew the attention and admiration of the intelligentsia as of the general populace even as the handworker himself was relegated to the lower ranks of professional occupations. The ancient rule of thumb: wonder and awe at the finished product, disdain for the dirty hands and lowly status of the man who produced it, persisted to some degree throughout classical antiquity. Yet this unlikeliest of vessels, the thickly built, balding, no longer youthful craftsman in his short one-shouldered tunic (compare the costume of the French butcher to this day), inexplicably housed the wherewithal required for making things marvelous to see, to report, and to hear about. How a block of unyielding stone or a batch of molten metal might be transformed into a life-size, lifelike replica of the human form, replete with eyes that seem to see and limbs that might at any moment change position, was regarded as the single most amazing feat of artisanal achievement for much of antiquity, and well it should have been. For no matter how the history of world art has been, is, or will be written, the fact remains that this particular achievement is uniquely Greek. Euripides was not alone in being in its thrall.

Perhaps no passage is more revealing of the playwright's engagement with the mechanics and the aesthetics of the art of statuary than fr. 125 (*Andromeda*), which was introduced in Chapter Two as evidence for monumental semi-nude statues of women from the later fifth century. Here quoted in full, it describes Perseus' first sight of the Ethiopian princess, whom, with her dark skin, he mistakes for a statue emerging from the rock: ἔα· τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὁρῶ περίρρυτον / ἀφρῷ θαλάσσης παρθένου τ' εἰκὼ τίνα / ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαΐνων τυκισμάτων, / σοφῆς ἄγαλμα χειρός; ("Ah! what is this rocky eminence I see flowing round with the foam of the sea? And what replica of a maiden 'chiseled' naturally

[201] Biehl, *Euripides Troades*, p. 414, points out that limbs, especially the hands, were singled out as measurers of likeness since Homer (e.g., *Od.* 4. 149).

out of the stone, an *agalma* of a wise hand?").[202] The hero's impression of Andromeda as a statue is confirmed when, in fr. 126, he observes, but significantly accepts, her silence: σιγᾷς; σιωπὴ δ' ἄπορος ἑρμηνεὺς λόγων. Andromeda turns out to be a real woman, but the fact that she is mistaken for a stone statue says much about (1) the lifelikeness that skillful Greek sculptors (σοφῆς χειρός) were able to achieve and (2) contemporary attitudes toward the art of stoneworking on a monumental scale. We shall now turn our attention to the latter.

The mimetic image made as if by chance from nature's own hand (αὐτομόρφων)[203] was an object of curiosity in antiquity, as a number of preserved anecdotes make clear. It was not enough that nature was responsible for living creatures; even more impressive were the instances in which nature produced artifacts that rivaled those produced by human artists, natural works of art, if you will. Pliny's stories attributing the origins of painting and of the modeling of portraits (35. 15, 151) to the act of tracing the accidental shadow of a man on a wall are prime examples of the apparent fascination with the skills, techniques, and inspiration of artists which led to comparisons with the ways of nature itself. Even closer to the topos that lies behind the sentiment preserved in Euripides' fr. 125 are anecdotes like that of Pliny 36. 14: "A marvelous story tells how in the quarries of Paros a block which was being split with wedges, opened and disclosed a figure of Seilenos."[204] Similarly, Cicero's *De divinatione* 1. 13. 23 relates that a head of Pan, which, assuredly, no one would mistake for a work by Scopas, had turned up when a stone

---

[202] There is some question of whether the second interrogative τίνα should be preferred to the indefinite τινα, or whether, as Diggle, *Studies*, p. 42, n. 2, recommends, it should be replaced with τινος; punctuation is also contested, although it does not affect the meaning. I follow Kannicht (*TrGF* 5) and Gibert in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, in preferring the interrogative form; for further discussion, see Gibert, op. cit., pp. 160–161. I retain τυκισμάτων, "brilliantly conjectured," according to Gibert, op. cit., p. 161, though he does not print it, by Jacobs for the senseless τειχισμάτων of the text as transmitted (Maximus), in preference to the sp., τυχ-, later suggested by Maas.

[203] For alternative explanations for αὐτομόρφος, which fail to convince me, see Gibert in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, p. 160, with a reference to Luigi Battezzato, "Pragmatica e retorica delle frasi interrogative in Euripide. Note ai fr. 125 e 255 Nauck e ad Andr. 366 s. (con una parentesi sul fr. 172 Nauck)," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 44 (2000), 141–173 (158–160), who has difficulties with the idea of combining, rather than contrasting, nature and art. Following Battezzato's lead, Gibert, op. cit., p. 147, translates "perfectly carved in stone," but also notes (p. 160), without specifying a reference, that some critics "think the word indicates that the craftsman found the rock's natural endowment suited to his creation."

[204] Trans. Jex-Blake/Sellars, p. 189.

was cut open at the Chian quarries. The immediate response: "no perfect imitation of a thing was ever made by chance," and the extensive analysis which the telling of the story spawns, including the following (2. 21. 48–49), suggests that such anecdotes were taken quite seriously:

> You also mentioned that myth from Carneades about the head of Pan—as if the likeness could not have been the result of chance! and as if every block of marble did not necessarily have within it heads worthy of Praxiteles! For his masterpieces were made by chipping away the marble, not by adding anything to it; and when, after much chipping, the lineaments of a face were reached, one then realized that the work now polished and complete had always been inside the block. Therefore, it is possible that some such figure as Carneades described did spontaneously appear in the Chian quarries. On the other hand, the story may be untrue. Again, you have often noticed clouds take the form of a lion or a hippo-centaur. Therefore it is possible for chance to imitate reality ...[205]

Apart from being entertaining and revealing of an undeniably ingenuous way of accounting for the technical mechanics of sculpture and stonecarving, these myths may be related to or even inspired by real studio practices. Dio Chrysostom (*The Twelfth, or Olympic, Discourse*, 45) wrote of the arts of stone and wood carving: "the artist little by little removes the excess of material until nothing remains but the shape which the observer sees ..."[206] No doubt influenced by ancient sources such as these, Michelangelo would articulate his own theory of artistic creativity, best known from the opening lines of his most famous sonnet (Saslow 151), in strikingly similar terms:

> Not even the best of artists has any conception
> that a single marble block does not contain
> within its excess, and *that* is only attained
> by the hand that obeys the intellect.[207]

And in this madrigal to Vittoria Colonna (Saslow 152):

> Just as, by taking away, lady, one puts
> into hard and alpine stone
> a figure that's alive
> and that grows larger wherever the stone decreases,
> so too are any good deeds

---

[205] Trans. W.A. Falconer, *Cicero, De senectute, De amicitia, De divinatione* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1953), pp. 251 and 425–427.

[206] Trans. J.W. Cohoon, *Dio Chrysostom, Discourses*, 2 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1961), p. 49.

[207] Trans. Saslow, *The Poetry of Michelangelo*, p. 302.

of the soul that still trembles
concealed by the excess mass of its own flesh,
which forms a husk that's coarse and crude and hard.[208]

A great deal more might be said of the history of the idea behind the artist as "finder" of something that is already there, but it would take us too far from the subject at hand.[209] A few comments, however, are in order. In an intriguing reference to poetic activity, Euripides uses εὑρίσκω ("to find," LSJ, s. v. i, 1). At *Med.* 194 and 196 the nurse bemoans the fact that the poets of old never "discovered" (εὑρίσκω, twice) a genre of song through which to remove men's sufferings.[210] The term here as elsewhere is often translated "invented," which, though it correctly captures the sense, disregards the most basic meaning of the term, which implies finding something already there rather than developing something out of nothing, as our use of "invention" connotes—a fine distinction, perhaps, but one worth making. Technological discovery or invention (a theme that is common in ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ-themed satyr plays) is one thing; however, the term used of artistic expression always gives me pause. It is not incidental that εὑρίσκω and cognates are adopted by Plato and others to describe what the creative artist does. For instance, at Plato, *Symposium* 209a, Demiourgoi are called εὑρετικοί; passages such as this, including the whole of the dialogue *Ion*, suggests that Plato respects artists who "find" or "discover" over those who are more literally "inspired" from an outside source (an idea, by the way, that might have reached Michelangelo by way of the Neoplatonists). A compound of the verb is used of poetic composition at Pi. *P.* 1. 60; the noun is used of the creator of a work of art (ἔργον) at Pi. *O.* 13. 17; Daidalos is referred to as a εὑρετής … πολλῶν τῶν συνεργούντων εἰς τὴν τέχνην at D.S. 4. 76. 1, to cite just a few examples.

In the end, however, the "artist as finder" is just an idea. The reality, of course, is far more mundane. At this point, we must digress a bit in order to understand the technical ramifications behind the image at fr. 125, as

208 Trans. Saslow, *The Poetry of Michelangelo*, p. 305.

209 Cf. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 68.

210 Cf. E. fr. 663 (*Sthen.*), which owes its preservation to the fact that it directly addresses poetic inspiration: ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα / Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ τὸ πρίν ("indeed Eros teaches [someone how to be] a poet, even if he was previously without inspiration"). The idea is timeless: love makes a poet out of anyone. Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 94, explains that it "reflects the tireless ancient debate, whether poetic or any skill (and later, morality) must be inborn and developed, or can be acquired from nothing."

I see it. There are broadly speaking two ways to approach the removal of superfluous stone, one practiced by the Egyptians for some 3000 years and by the early Greeks, the other practiced by the Classical and Hellenistic Greeks and Romans, and Michelangelo. In this I follow Bluemel's characterization of the techniques of Greek monumental stone sculpture in his classic study, *Greek Sculptors at Work*, with some modifications.[211] The Archaic Greek sculptor, like the Egyptian from whom he might have learned (D.S. 1. 98. 5–9), would begin by drawing a rough outline of his figure onto each of the four faces of a block of stone. With a punch (a pointed chisel) he would methodically remove all of the material lying outside of those contour lines, moving and cutting more or less continuously round and round the block. Proceeding with a sequence of increasingly smaller and finer chisels, claw and flat, then various rasps and abrasives, he would achieve further and further definition in his work. The important point is that the Archaic sculptor always removed one complete layer from all around the figure at one time; he allowed no detail to obtrude or to demand his sole attention as he was working: the eyes, the hair, the toes—all were equally important and grew with and became absorbed into the whole. The effect according to Bluemel is that every Greek sculpture of the early period is "absolutely complete and whole at each stage of the work."[212]

In the Early Classical period, with the advent of asymmetrical, active, multi-aspected and thus more challenging poses in three-dimensional monumental sculpture, the simple, four-sided approach of Archaic sculptors no longer sufficed. It is thought that at least from the time of the pediments of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (ca. 470–456 BC) some sort of models in wax or in clay were employed, with some sort of pointing system used to transfer the contours of the smaller-scaled model to the full-scaled monumental stone sculpture. Simply put, the most prominent points were marked and the statue worked back from these points using calipers and plumb lines to mark the subtler transitions between planes

[211] Carl Bluemel, *Greek Sculptors at Work*, trans. Lydia Holland and rev. by Betty Ross (1927; 2nd Eng. ed., London, 1969). The more thorough treatment of Adam, *The Technique of Greek Sculpture*, attempts to challenge Bluemel concerning the uses of individual carving tools and the chronology of their introduction, but does not discredit him on fundamental principles. The most recent examination of sculptural techniques, Palagia, "Marble Carving Techniques," updates Adam on some important points, but does not alter the picture significantly.

[212] Bluemel, *Greek Sculptors at Work*, p. 20.

and contours.[213] This fundamentally different approach to the block that characterizes sculpture from the Classical period onward, unlike the Archaic approach in which a human form was coherent from the very beginning of carving, creates the sensation that the statue is gradually released from its stone encasement. At a pivotal stage of this process, prior to its full emergence from the block, the figure appears as if in high relief against the backdrop of the stone. The technique of Michelangelo about which we have much literary evidence offers the best analogy. At a glance this Renaissance sculptor's unfinished "Awakening (also known as the Cross-legged) Captive," one of a series of such figures, originally intended for the tomb of Julius II and now in the Academia di Belle Arti, Florence, might pass for a figure carved in high relief.[214] The reason for this is clear: Michelangelo drew his figure on one side of the block only and worked *in*—much as if he were carving a relief—instead of *around*. Vasari provides a contemporary description of how Michelangelo worked: "[It is as if] one takes a figure made of wax or other firm material and immerses it in a vessel of water: the figure is then gradually raised, displaying first the uppermost parts, the rest being hidden, and as it rises more and more the whole comes into view."[215] Scrutinizing the "Awakening Captive" validates Vasari's impression: The parts of the body which protrude the most are even in this early state the most highly finished areas of the work, while those whose anatomical positions necessitate their being kept deeper in the recesses of the block are as yet only roughed out or still unarticulated. The uncanny feeling that a bearded male figure is struggling in vain to emerge from the mass of stone is enhanced by the fact that he is portrayed as actually struggling and with an agonized expression on his face.

By now the relationship between the idea of mistaking a beautiful naked woman chained to a rocky cliff for a statue, and contemporary practices which dictated that the sculptor work from the front to the back of the stone, gradually revealing the statue that had been "hidden" therein all along, should be apparent. We might think of the pivotal stage

[213] The new technical approach to monumental sculpture-in-the-round in the Classical period is described in greater detail in Bluemel, *Greek Sculptors at Work*, pp. 34–46, of which my description is a summary.

[214] The series of four is illustr. in Frederick Hartt, *Michelangelo. The Complete Sculpture* (New York, 1968), figs. 265–276, the one under discussion, figs. 274–276. The unfinished "St. Matthew" in the Accademia (Hartt, op. cit., figs. 126–128), is also instructive.

[215] Trans. George Bull, *Giorgio Vasari. The Lives of the Artists* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1965), p. 421.

when a statue is in highest relief, but still clearly attached to the stone, that is, the cliff face, clearly a product of nature, which might also, for all that can be told, be responsible for the "accident" of the female figure protruding from it. The ways of art, to the lay observer, are as it seems so unfathomable that nature itself offers the only worthy comparison. On the other hand, for the maker, while much of the "mystery" translates into painstaking, often backbreaking, labor, it re-emerges when he beholds the lifelikeness of his "discovery," which takes on its own momentum of existence thenceforth.

Another point of potential signification arises from the circumstance of Andromeda's being attached to a rock face. In the case of ancient stonecarving the material alone was enough to command awe, not the least inspired by an awareness of its ancient origins and the laborious means whereby blocks of quarried stone made their way down from the mountain and into the hands of the sculptor. For without doubt the majestic settings where the finest carving marbles could be found struck the first notes of sublimity and helped to engender, to a great extent, an attitude bordering on reverence for the final product of the stonecarver's art. The miraculous incidents described by both Pliny and Cicero occur in quarries. Mountains provided both stimulus and substance for grandiose conceptions like that related by Vitruvius (2. 1) about the Hellenistic architect Deinocrates who once approached Alexander with a plan to carve Mt. Athos into a colossal figure of a man. Stone itself was regarded as "living" when still embedded in its mountain setting. Add to all of this the fascination with which the ancients regarded mimetic images found purely by chance in nature and the multiple allusions of the *Andromeda* passage become evident.

Perseus sees Andromeda as if in high relief awaiting release from the rock by the wise hand of some nameless master sculptor. She is doubly alive, since the hand of the unknown artisan has rendered her with sufficient naturalism to deceive those looking, and the stone out of which she is "made" is still moored to its own source of life, the mountain. Like Michelangelo's unfinished "Captives," Andromeda struggles for life against the bonds of the stone, a captive of nature, dependent upon a clever and heroic sculptor to release her, the physical record of her ongoing struggle visible to a would-be rescuer as susceptible to her beauty as to the pathos of her untenable situation, just as an unfinished statue in a sculptor's workshop. In releasing her Perseus will thereby usurp the role of the artisan, which must make him feel very powerful indeed. And just like a real-life stonecarver who has through the sweat-

inducing labor of his person succeeded in releasing his statue from its stone prison, with the creative act complete, this mythical "creator" joins the ranks of other mere beholders in awe of the beauty and lifelike presence of his creation.

Our next example is no less revealing for being humorous. Typical for *Cyclops*, language associated with such lofty matters as the visual arts is accompanied by an aura of irreverent reverence. So at *Cy.* 411 Odysseus is so impressed with his own brilliant idea about how to stop the Cyclops from consuming any more of his men that he graces it with an epithet more appropriately used of inspired artistry: ἐσῆλθέ μοί τι θεῖον ("something positively divine came to me").[216] The inflated term is put to immediate service as a pun when the wine that is to be used in the "divine" plot is called a θεῖον πῶμα at *Cy.* 415. However, the earlier appearance is clearly intended to indicate "something inspired," and not necessarily directly from a god. That the substance of the "inspiration" turns out to be wine deflates the puffery of the original sentiment and slyly draws attention to the possibility that inspiration and intoxication are much the same thing—a notion that might have amused the Socrates of Plato's *Ion*. Seriously, though, ancient testimony about what θεῖος can mean in an art critical sense is found in a passage from Porphyry (*De abst.* 2, 18 [= *TrGF* 3 T 114]) that has already been mentioned in our discussion of this term in connection with the ending of *Andromache*. The significant portions are as follows:

> The oldest terracotta and wooden statues of seated gods are thought to possess more godliness on account of both the material and the simplicity of the craftsmanship (μᾶλλον θεῖα νενόμισται διά τε τὴν ὕλην καὶ τὴν ἀφέλειαν τῆς τέχνης, vv. 1–2) … For the old statues, although they were simply made, are thought to be godly, while the new ones inspire awe on account of having been elaborately worked, but possess less of an appearance of godliness (ταῦτα γὰρ καίπερ ἁπλῶς πεποιημένα θεῖα νομίζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ καινὰ περιέργως εἰργασμένα θαυμάζεσθαι μέν, θείου δὲ δόξαν ἧττον ἔχειν, vv. 6–8).

In an unusual twist the more flattering language is reserved for Archaic art over Classical. What the finest Archaic statues may lack in technical or conceptual sophistication—in this they can be said to be "simpler"

[216] Simmonds and Timberlake *Euripides. The Cyclops*, p. 42: " 'something from heaven,' i.e., 'an inspiration.' " Pollitt, *AVGA*, does not include θεῖος in his index of Greek and Latin art critical terms.

(ἁπλῶς)[217] than Classical statues—they make up for in a quality called θεῖα, the same term used at *Cy*. 411. Pausanias (2. 4. 5) provides an insight into this meaning of θεῖος when he reveals that the works of the mytho-historical Daidalos are said to be ἔνθεον. We should think of "inspired" in the favorable modern sense as denoting a remarkably high level of artistry in the form of quality of concept, craftsmanship, and lifelikeness. Note also in the Porphyrean passage the use of the verb πεποιημένα for the making of Archaic statues to contrast with εἰργασμένα, used of Classical statues. The two verbs reflect a hierarchy among artistic processes. In Plato's *Symposium* (205b–c) Diotima points out that poetry (ποίησις) literally means "creating," or "inspired making," (in English); it is, however, a multivalent term, and the act of making something out of nothing among the sister arts and crafts can also partake of being called "making," in the sense of our term, "creating." By contrast, as Bury puts it best, Plato's word ἐργασίαι "denotes manufacturing processes."[218] The former is clearly the more elevating term. That said, θεῖος at *Cy*. 411 could be read as an unflattering reference to an *archaic*, in the sense of "outdated," ideal; even Daidalos himself, along with his legendary accomplishments, had taken up residence as a popular figure in comedy and satyr play in the fifth century.

The manifold creations of the mytho-historical sculptor, architect, and inventor Daidalos are emblematic of artistic innovation throughout much of Greek antiquity. We first hear of him and his inspired work as builder at Knossos of the "dancing floor" for Ariadne that Hephaistos imitates on the shield of Achilles at *Il*. 18. 592, followed by Bacchylides' description of Daidalos as τεκτόν[ω]ν σοφῳ[τάτῳ (*Dithyr*. 26. 6 [Snell and Maehler]), and τὸ Δαιδάλου μ[ί]μημα· φωνῆς δεῖ μόνον from v. 7 of the fragment of Aeschylus' lost satyr-play *Theoroi* (*TrGF* 3 F 78a), in which Daidalos may also have appeared as a character.[219] It would be incomprehensible for Euripides, with his interest in the visual arts, to have neglected this iconic figure, and to be sure, the corpus contains

[217] I read ἁπλῶς with the mss. and not the synonym ἀφελῶς suggested by Nauck and printed by Radt, because the former is well-documented as an art critical term (Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 141–143).

[218] R.G. Bury, *The Symposium of Plato* (Cambridge, Eng., 1932), p. 107.

[219] The identity of the person who offers the satyrs the portraits as the fragment opens is unknown, but Daidalos, as the maker of the objects, is a strong candidate; see Stieber, "Aeschylus' *Theoroi*," p. 87, n. 5. For further discussion of the ancient testimonia on Daidalos, including those from the Euripidean corpus, see, e.g., Morris, *Daidalos*, pp. 215–268; Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, pp. 50–58; Donohue, *Xoana*, pp. 179–183.

evidence enough to substantiate Euripides' mindfulness of the essential features of the Daidalic legend, even though by this time the epithet is more a staple of poetry than an art critical category. Exquisitely crafted objects made of the finest materials are characterized, in the manner of an epic epithet, by the adjectival form of the proper name. Thus, the yarns used to weave the Panathenaic peplos are called δαιδαλέαισι by a chorus musing about their future lives in Greece at *Hec.* 470. In another choral passage (*IA* 219) the magnificent horses of the charioteer Eumelos are reined with golden "daidalic" bits (χρυσοδαιδάλτοις στομίοις). Of the coinage χρυσοδαιδάλτος, Sarah P. Morris, in her essential monograph, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, notes that it is "of the variety indulged by Bacchylides," and an instance of Euripides' use of epic and lyric language in a lyric passage. She goes astray, however, in assuming that the epithet refers to the "elaborately decorated harness' " of the horse; it is rather a reference to the bit, which has been fashioned of gold, an incredibly superfluous material for the purpose, allowing it to lay proper claim to the epithet "daidalic," while not technically "ornamented."[220] While epicisms such as these cannot necessarily be claimed as evidence for Euripides' dedicated interest in the visual arts, they do lend their presence to the overall picture of a playwright taking special pains to characterize the crafted objects that he introduces into the plots of his plays.

A more meaningful use of the adjective δαίδαλον is found at *HF* 470–471, where it appears as an epithet of Heracles' club, which, we are told, the hero used to put teasingly into the right hand of one of his young sons: ἀλεξητήριον / ξύλον ... δαίδαλον, ψευδῆ δόσιν ("a wooden daidalic means of protection, a false gift").[221] The use of the term δαίδαλον clearly lends this genre scene a lofty, epic tone, appropriate for the tragic drama that ensues. As Morris points out, "the word demonstrates tragic use of the traditional language for magic weapons and for those with a narrative history, as in epic and lyric diction." She goes on to suggest that the club is δαίδαλος because of its famous adventures in the hands of the hero.[222] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff had noted that the image in part is meant to emphasize the hero's αὐτάρκεια, since Heracles had cut his

---

[220] Morris, *Daidalos*, pp. 63–64, citing the term's only other occurrence at Ar. *Ec.* 972.

[221] A ms. has the genitive, as if the proper name were meant; Hermann corrected to the adj., which most editors, including Diggle, follow. There is no evidence for Daidalos having given Heracles the club.

[222] Morris, *Daidalos*, pp. 64–65.

own club from an olive tree [?] from Nemea, according to Apollod. 2. 4. 11.[223] Bond, however, dismisses this interpretation, arguing instead that "δαίδαλον indicates a club of solid metal or inlaid with metal," which would be somewhat hard to square with ξύλον.[224] Paley meanwhile assumes that Hephaistos was the donor of the club, thereby justifying an epithet suggestive of divinely inspired craftsmanship.[225]

There is little justification or, it would seem, dramaturgical purpose in reducing the force of the epithet to a mere indication of a specific medium or technique, as may be the case with the other Euripidean uses of "daidalic." In addition to the qualities that Morris mentions, the fact that Heracles might have cut his own club and that it has capabilities that verge on the magical—it is, after all, wielded by a demigod—would account well enough for the epithet in this context. But there may be additional ramifications. Bond presumes that the club is a ψευδῆ δόσιν simply because the boy had to give it back.[226] However, the juxtaposition of δαίδαλος and ψευδῆ in apposition is hard to miss. Daidalos is a known trickster, as his co-operation with Pasiphaë demonstrates, and the adjectival form of his name and its cognates aptly bear the denotation "cunningly wrought" (LSJ, s. v.); it should also be noted that Daidalos qualifies as a master illusionist and deceiver owing to the fact that his works are reputed to appear to be alive when in fact they are not. If the juxtaposition of two words that suggest deceit is intentional, then the club is a gift from his father that lies, in the manner of Daidalos, because it will not in the end protect the boy from harm, as promised, but will instead, in his father's own hand, prove the instrument of the boy's murder (*HF* 991–994).

One further nuance is possible. At *HF* 1376–1385 Heracles, now the murderer of his wife and children, directly apostrophizes his weapons, the bow and the club which unwittingly became the instruments of his family's destruction. He inquires of the objects if indeed he should keep them or discard them, thereby leaving the disgraced hero vulnerable before his future enemies.[227] Heracles imagines the weapons falling

---

[223] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles*, 2, p. 116.

[224] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 186, comparing *HF* 993 and σιδηροβριθές … ξύλον in fr. 531 (*Meleager*).

[225] Paley[2] 3, p. 41.

[226] Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, p. 187.

[227] John Kirkpatrick and Francis Dunn, "Heracles, Cercopes, and Paracomedy," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132 (2002), 29–61, argue that this motif, which is "out of place in tragedy" (op. cit., p. 29), is a deliberate allusion to one of Hera-

against his flanks actually *speaking* to him in a continually mocking reminder of his horrible misdeeds. The verb used to convey the action of "falling," προσπίτνω, however, is an unusual choice: It is the term commonly used of human acts of supplication or worship. It is as if, rather than mocking him, the beloved weapons beg the hero's forgiveness. He decides to keep them, in spite of the pain of enduring the constant clattering sounds of their "voices." Regarding δαίδαλον at *HF* 471 in light of the eventual personification of the weapons, we may fairly be reminded of those characteristics that are routinely attributed to the works of Daidalos, that they speak, see, and move, and that "daidalic" and cognates, by the fifth century, are virtually synonyms for "lifelike" and "animate."

Another such allusion, which has generally been overlooked by scholars in their attention to the Euripidean references to Daidalos, occurs at *Alc.* 1143, when Admetus asks why the woman whom Heracles is claiming as a revitalized Alcestis does not speak (τί γάρ ποθ' ἥδ' ἄναυδος ἕστηκεν γυνή; ["For why ever does my wife stand speechless"]). The language echoes the stock formulae for describing Daidalic statues, illustrated in the passage from Aeschylus' *Theoroi* quoted above, as well as in Euripides' own fr. 372. 2–3 (*Eurystheus*): τὰ Δαιδάλεια πάντα κινεῖσθαι δοκεῖ / λέγειν τ' ἀγάλμαθ'· ὧδ' ἀνὴρ κεῖνος σοφός ("all statues made by Daidalos seem to move and to speak;[228] thus, that man is highly skilled"). With Daidalos in mind, ἕστηκεν at *Alc.* 1143 suddenly assumes significance: The woman both *stands still* and is silent, unlike statues by Daidalos which both move and speak. In his persistence in highlighting the very opposite qualities that one would expect to find in a lifelike statue, Euripides, through well-chosen language alone, succeeds in drawing attention to the "statuesque" qualities of the resurrected Alcestis. This, as I have argued in the past, is meant as an uncomfortable reminder both to Admetus and the audience of Admetus' shocking earlier wish to commission a portrait statue of his dying wife "from the wise

---

cles' comic exploits, the adventure with the brothers Cercopes, a popular subject in early fourth-century comedy and satyr play. Hecuba addresses the shield of Hector at *Tr.* 1194–1199, but of course it does not respond; at *Ph.* 1677, a sword is personified as a witness to an oath. While E. does occasionally incorporate comic elements in his tragedies, I find it extremely hard to imagine anything intentionally comical in any of these scenes.

228 Depending whether βλέπει/βλέπειν or λέγειν is read; I follow N^2, who prints λέγειν, a conjecture by Schmidt, since it conforms better with the usual formulae for characterizing the works of Daidalos; cf. Kassel, "Dialoge mit Statuen," p. 5. Kannicht in *TrGF* 5 prints βλέπει<ν>, followed by Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7.

hand of a craftsman" (Daidalos, himself?) to be placed in their bed.[229] The real-life mystery woman, while she still lacks a voice, is eventually able to move—she accompanies Admetus into his house at the play's conclusion—whereas Daidalos' images only seem to be able to move. On the other hand, the statue of Artemis actually moves at *IT* 1165 and 1167, as if in literal fulfillment of the inherent Daidalic potential of all archaic images.[230]

Few passages in Euripides have generated as much commentary as *Hec.* 836–838, where the anguished Trojan matriarch longs for a voice everywhere in her body so that all of her parts, including her footsteps, might speak, whether "by the art of Daidalos or from some god" (ἢ Δαιδάλου τέχναισιν ἢ θεῶν τινος). Mossman correctly adduces that, contrary to the views of some interpreters, the image is not at all grotesque or to be compared with the terrifying Fama in *Aeneid* 4.[231] A scholiast on these lines explains their aptness: περὶ τῶν Δαιδάλου ἔργων, ὅτι ἐκινεῖτο καὶ προΐει φωνήν ("concerning the works of Daidalos, because they move and project a voice"), and for further clarification, usefully appends Euripides' fr. 372 (*Eurystheus*), quoted above, where Daidalic statues are claimed to be deceptively capable of moving and speaking. In his interpretation of the passage, Rehm overlooks its most important feature, that its language directly echoes that used formulaically of statue-making, when he allows that "Hecuba lets loose a utopian cry for a new artistic creation" that would prove totally coherent to a resistant Agamemnon.[232]

Simply put, Hecuba wishes she were a statue. The notion is profoundly revealing of later fifth-century views of art and the artist. It is as if statues could be more eloquent than living, breathing, human beings as messengers of pain and suffering, as if a sculptor (the mention of a god seems an afterthought) could be so expert at conveying the illusion of life in a lifeless format, at animating the inanimate, that he could make any part of the body seem alive through his σοφίσματα, as if there is something more lifelike than life itself in the most successful works of plastic art. This, in the face of the fact that Classical statues do *not* exhibit emotions, is powerful testimony to the artist's rendering of their capability for doing so, just as for the capability of movement, in lieu of

229 Stieber, "Statuary in Euripides' *Alcestis*."
230 Kyraikou, *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, p. 375, suggests that Iphigenia invents the portent. I see no indication in the text that this is the case.
231 Mossman, *Wild Justice*, pp. 128–129, with references in n. 92.
232 Rehm, *The Play of Space*, p. 178.

real movement. Why does it seem that no living human hand can match the eerie sensation of life emitted, for instance, from the marble left hand of the Virgin in Michelangelo's St. Peter's "Pietà"? The same might be said of the Hermes with the Infant Dionysos in the Olympia Museum today, breathing unmistakable life into the virtually empty room that has been reserved for the statue solely to work its magic. The list could go on. Yes, these experiences are subjective, but they are universal. The history of art is littered with anecdotes recording the lifelikeness of statues; the Pygmalion myth is the symptom, not the inspiration for these testimonies.

Peleus finds himself in a comparable state at *Andr.* 1078 where, upon hearing the news of his grandson's death, the old man loses the capacities both to speak and to move: φρούδη μὲν αὐδή, φροῦδα δ' ἄρθρα μου κάτω. Neither dead nor alive, he is adrift somewhere in the ideological space between animacy and inanimacy, bereft of even those basic attributes which permit a well-made and intelligently conceived statue to impersonate a vibrant, emotive, living being. On the other hand Heracles' expressed wish, at *HF* 1397, to become merely stone, unformed into a statue with more than a semblance of life, is a logical request to be rendered *insensate* of the surrounding tragedy for which he is responsible. It takes a wise hand to bring stone to life; Heracles, in his present situation, will have none of it, while Hecuba begs for the matchless expressive potential of a sculpted image.

Not incidentally the *Hecuba* passage also offers referenda on the effectiveness of verbal communication[233] and, more importantly, on the ability of an actor to play the scene convincingly, not to mention of acting itself as a mimetic genre. Both Steiner and Golder, while they offer differing interpretations of the passage, subscribe to the idea that the audience's attention is being drawn to the actor's stylized gestures, which happen to resemble those of a statue, thereby contributing a kind of punning visual commentary on the sentiment expressed in the lines.[234] However, I suspect the opposite, that there is little attention being given to these gestures at this particular moment; the normal tools of the actors' trade, the standard formulaic gesticulations would hardly stand out as significant when Hecuba expresses her wish to become a statue. On the contrary the gesturing, which is normally effective in conveying emotions on the Greek

---

[233] Cf. Steiner, *Images in Mind*, p. 52: "the turn to a work of art signals the limitations of the verbal medium."

[234] Steiner, *Images in Mind*, p. 53, with n. 151; Golder, "Making a Scene," p. 4.

stage, probably stopped abruptly as Hecuba utters lines which concede their momentary *ineffectuality*, the better to draw attention to the fact that she is *not* a statue, to her great disadvantage in the present situation.

We do not know the context of fr. 988 (*Cret.* [incer., *TrGF* 5]), nor even if it belongs with the play to which it has been assigned. Collard and Cropp believe it to be "almost certainly" from *Cretans* and that Minos addresses the line to Daidalos, accusing him of assisting Pasiphaë by building the artificial cow: τέκτων γὰρ ὢν ἔπρασσες οὐ ξυλουργικά. They translate: "You are a builder but what you did was not carpentry."[235] There is little consistency in the use of τέκτων to describe a specialized craftsman in Euripides, nor should it be expected; the term originated as a description of a woodworker, but by the fifth century, it had come to be used of all kinds of craftsmen and skilled workers (LSJ, s. v.).[236] That the τέκτων of *Alc.* 348 is a marble worker and that Alcestis' statue is to be of marble may be inferred when Admetus calls it a "cold pleasure" (ψυχρὰν … τέρψιν, v. 353), a reference both to the object's ultimate unsuitability for intimacy and to the way a stone statue actually feels to the touch.[237] (For it is one thing to look at a statue and be convinced it is alive, and another altogether to touch—let alone embrace—a statue, which confirms that it is not.) Daidalos himself is described as a sculptor both in wood and in stone.[238] One way to interpret fr. 988 is to assume that we have two distinct references to a craftsman, in linguistic terms, one unmarked (τέκτων) and the other marked ([πράσσειν] ξυλουργικά). The sense of the passage would then be: "While you *are* a craftsman by trade, apparently you were not making wooden things, but rather were up to no good scheming with my wife against me." In this case the periphrasis ἔπρασσες ξυλουργικά could be regarded as dismissive of all artisans, who are thereby reduced to mere carpenters and joiners. Alternatively, the intent could be to contrast the two expressions, that is to say to distinguish two categories or even social strata of craftsmen. The sense would then be something like: "although you are a τέκτων, you are

---

235 Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7, p. 555; cf. Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, pp. 67 ("You are a builder, but you were not practising carpentry") and 78, noting, however, the awkwardness of translating τέκτων, "builder."

236 Cf. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans*, pp. 298–299; *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), pp. 74–75.

237 Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Lee, p. 78, in citing *Alc.* 348 as a comparandum, assumes, mistakenly, I believe, that the statue is to be of wood. The use of τέκτονος at S. *Tr.* 768, although it remains somewhat puzzling, seems also to imply a worker in stone rather than in wood.

238 E.g., Plato Com. fr. 204 (*PCG*) (wood); D.S. 4. 76. 1 (stone).

not engaged in woodworking," the usual occupation of a τέκτων, thereby to imply that this particular wonderworking artisan (Daidalos) answers to a higher calling, in this instance, playing god.

With a mere τέκτων capable of such extraordinary feats as are attributed to Daidalos throughout Greek literature, one is left to suspect that the craft of carpentry was regarded in antiquity as an exclusive arena for wonderworking. To such an attitude may be owed the prominent role of the carpenter, his raw material, and the craft of woodworking in the philosophies of both Plato and Aristotle, most conspicuously in their cosmogonies.[239] It is also well to recall that Jesus of Nazareth was a carpenter. On a slightly less exalted level, there can be no question from the point of view of linguistics of the precedence of the craft of woodworking in what, by the early fifth century, had become a standard metaphor for the artistry of the poet, an activity which throughout antiquity was regarded as a higher calling than other forms of artisanship, as it was once assumed to have been divinely guided.[240] By the end of the century, however, divine guidance was no longer viable, and the visual arts stood a chance of attaining equal footing. Evidence of Euripides' awareness of this development is considered in the next and last section of the chapter, and makes for a fitting conclusion to the entire study.

The Hand That is Σοφός

We return one final time to the language of *Alc.* 348, in particular, the curious expression that inspired the title of the present chapter, σοφῇ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων, in which Euripides has Admetus acknowledge that "a wise or practiced hand" of a craftsman is the best guarantor of quality and verisimilitude in a mimetic work of art. This notion is reiterated in fr. 125. 4 (*Andromeda*), in which Perseus, at first sight of Andromeda, mistakes her for a statue, the product of another anonymous "wise hand" (σοφῆς ἄγαλμα χειρός). It is invoked yet again in fr. 372. 2–3 (*Eurystheus*), in which case, the man behind the "wise" artisinal hand

239 On which see Friedrich Solmsen, "Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963), 473–496 (481–482 and 489–494). Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, pp. 19–78, collects and comments on the ancient literary references to the wordworker.

240 Ford, *The Origins of Criticism*, pp. 93–130; Nagy, *Poetry as Performance*, pp. 74–76, who discusses, among other things, the Indo-European tradition of comparing a well-composed song to a well-crafted chariot wheel.

(here, implied) is named: Daidalos (τὰ Δαιδάλεια πάντα κινεῖσθαι δοκεῖ / λέγειν τ' ἀγάλμαθ'· ὧδ' ἀνὴρ κεῖνος σοφός [translated above]). Now hands are not normally characterized as "wise;" although craftsman's σοφία itself is a familiar concept from the time of Homer, the juxtaposition is striking, if not jarring, especially in the age of the Sophists. Moreover, σοφὴ χείρ as a succinct and colorful formulation for the particular brand of wisdom that an artisan possesses is not, to my knowledge, paralleled elsewhere in Greek literature, other than the Hellenistic and later *Greek Anthology*, and there likely under the influence of the classical tragedian.[241]

Euripides is evidently impressed with the wisdom of the hand, to judge from the cumulative effect produced by the evidence presented in this study, an attitude that on occasion finds direct expression. Among the qualities singled out for praise in the ode to Athens in *Medea*, Athenian skills in the arts are allied with Sophia, herself, in a rare personification: τᾷ Σοφίᾳ παρέδρους ... Ἔρωτας, / παντοίας ἀρετᾶς ξυνεργούς ("Erotes, sitting beside Sophia, co-crafters of excellence of every sort," vv. 844–845).[242] On the other hand, the association of σοφός with skilled craftsmen in a positive sense is behind its perversion at *Med.* 409, when Medea, herself a craftswoman of a different sort, brands all women κακῶν δὲ πάντων τέκτονες σοφώταται ("the cleverest crafters of all evils"). Architects, too, may be "wise" in their profession, as we saw at *Ion* 1139, where their knowledge gained through experience was cited as an authority for laying out the dimensions of the festival tent. The same reverential attitude toward the expertise of the artisan/architect lies behind Odysseus' advice to his companions at *Cy.* 477–478: "obey the architects" (τοῖσιν ἀρχιτέκτοσιν / πείθεσθ'). That very wisdom is circumvented at *Andr.* 1014–1015, where Poseidon is berated by the

---

[241] The exact phrase is found in a Hellenistic epigram by Asclepiades (Gow and Page 44, v. 1; *AP* 9. 752) and in *APl* 16. 262, which is likely to be Byzantine, as well as in two other epigrams, 101 and 402, which I have been unable to track down except on *TLG*. At any rate the rarity of the language and the lateness of the sources leave open the possibility that they could have been inspired by Euripides. Gow and Page, *The Greek Anthology*, 2, p. 148, commenting on σοφῆς χερός in the poem by Asclepiades, note only that "The noun, though more commonly in the plural, is frequent in reference to craftsmen and craftsmanship," while they cite as comparanda nothing earlier than Theocritus (where I have been unable to trace the expression) and the mime Herodas. The latter does not, however, use the identical language, even though the concept is similar: ἀληθιναί αἱ χεῖρες (Herod. 4. 72 [Headlam and Knox]).

[242] Page, *Euripides Medea*, p. 134, would include only those arts patronized by the muses. However, the combination of σοφία and ἀρετή with ξυνεργούς, which can have an artisanal connotation (LSJ, s. v. ii), suggests that the visual arts might be included.

chorus for engaging in the destruction of the walls of Troy, the god's own handiwork, a counterintuitive act that amounted to an ἄτιμον ὀργάνας χέρα τεκτοσύνας ("a hand deprived of [the evidence of] its building expertise").[243]

Common to, and remarkable in, all of these Euripidean passages is the presumption without question that *intellectual skill* (σοφία) is the province of the handworker, whether artisan or artist, the recognition that excellence in the visual arts involves brainpower, and that the very best visual artists/artisans are individuals with a high degree of intellectual capacity, no less so than those occupied with other cerebral activities.[244] There is no need to think of *sophia*, as Pollitt and others do in general discussion of the topic, as "theoretical knowledge," in contrast with *technê*, "practical skill."[245] Nothing suggests that these terms used of artisans indicate anything other than artisinal intelligence, in essence, a recognition of the intellectual aspects of artistic activity; theory may, but need not necessarily, enter into it. Eventually Aristotle would offer a definition of "wisdom" in the visual arts (*EN* 6. 7 [1141a]): "We apply the term 'wisdom' in the arts to those who are most exacting in their art." (τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἔν τε ταῖς τέχναις τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις τὰς τέχνας ἀποδίδομεν). It becomes clear that by τέχναι he means the fine arts when he names Pheidias and Polykleitos as exemplars, continuing: "thus, then, meaning that wisdom is nothing other than that which is excellent in art" (ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν οὐθὲν ἄλλο σημαίνοντες τὴν σοφίαν ἢ ὅτι ἀρετὴ τέχνης ἐστίν).

---

243 I print the text (sans misprint) of Kovacs, *Euripides*, 2, with his own emendation, ὀργάνας, for the ὀργάναν of most mss. Diggle, adopting an emendation by Carey, also printed by Lloyd, *Euripides Andromache*, has χεροτεκτοσύνας (if so, a *hapax* and a term noteworthy for its tautology) for the mss. χέρα τεκτοσύνας. Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, p. 215, who wrote before the latter emendation was suggested, outlines the difficulties presented by the mss. reading.

244 Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, pp. 44–45 and passim, is very clear on this point, as she lays out the evidence for parallels between the interests and preoccupations of fifth-century artists and the pre-Socratics.

245 On the use of σοφός, σοφία and cognates for artisans' skills, see, e.g., Pollitt, *AVGA*, pp. 92–94, Morris, *Daidalos*, p. 221; in poetry, Penelope Murray, "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101 (1981), 87–100 (98–99), W.J. Verdenius, "The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism," *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983), 14–59 (20–24), Art L. Spisak, "Martial 6. 61: Callimachean Poetics Revalued," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994), 291–308. On the concept in Euripides, see R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus. An Interpretation of the Bacchae* (1948; 2nd ed., London, 2003), pp. 167–168.

Euripides was inordinately fond of the *sophos* word group; a scholiast remarks on it, and the numerous surviving testimonia to the playwright's being *sophos*, some with evident irony (e.g., Pl. *R.* 568a), may also be related.[246] Friedrich Maier, in his 1970 doctoral dissertation on Euripides' treatment of the "*sophos*-concept," came up the following comparative statistics: at least 63 occurrences in extant Euripides, including 13 of *sophia;* only 13 in Aeschylus, with no instances of *sophia;* 25 in Sophocles, with two *sophia*.[247] As Maier's analysis makes clear, Euripides' involvement with the concept ranges widely across the positive/negative interpretative spectrum. There is always the possibility that *sophos*, whenever it appears in context with the visual arts, maintains undertones of "deception" and "trickery," given that all mimetic arts are inherently "deceptive," though even this need not be regarded as unflattering. On the whole, however, the passages presented above convey a straightforward recognition of the power and authority of the visual artist/artisan, the same tendency that we have identified throughout the Euripidean corpus. That said, we cannot expect uniformity, as Maier's research demonstrates. The complexity of Euripides' thinking on the issue is perhaps best exemplified by the paradox of *Ba.* 395, which is virtually untranslatable: τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία. For our purposes, the length and complexity of Maier's treatment alone testify that Euripides thought long, deeply, and throughout his career about the concept; some of that thinking centered on its application to the visual arts. An immediate explanation is not far to seek; as Winnington-Ingram's remarks: "Euripides wrote for an age preoccupied with the idea of *Sophia*."[248]

In his lengthy treatment of Euripides, Maier does not dwell upon the expression "wise hand."[249] He is more concerned with the developing sophistic content of the term in the context of the late fifth century, and with the breadth, uniqueness, and often radical nature of this playwright's multiple adaptations, in other words, with Euripides looking forward rather than backward. Significantly, however, while σοφός and related terms are used routinely during the fifth century of skill in *poetic* composition, in the most conspicuous case, more or less self-referentially throughout Pindar,[250] they are less commonly enlisted to do justice to

[246] Schwartz, ad loc. *Med.* 665. The testimonia are collected by Kannicht, *TrGF* 5, T Uc.

[247] Friedrich Maier, *Der ΣΟΦΟΣ-Begriff. Zur Bedeutung, Wertung und Rolle des Begriffes von Homer bis Euripides* (Dissertation: Munich, 1970), p. 303, n. 1.

[248] Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus*, p. 167.

[249] Maier, *Der ΣΟΦΟΣ-Begriff*, pp. 298–366. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 74, suggests only that it is a dismissive way to refer to the artist, as "überhaubt nur pars pro toto."

[250] E.g., *N.* 7. 23; *I.* 7. 18; *I.* 1. 45; *O.* 1. 116; *O.* 9. 38; *P.* 1. 12; *P.* 3. 113; *P.* 4. 248; *P.* 6. 49.

a high level of exhibited competence in a work of visual art or craft. Euripides' complimentary use of σοφός to characterize the expert craftsman in the second half of the fifth century harks back to a time when the term and its cognates were as naturally applied to the handworking professions as to those which involved more obviously mental dexterities.[251]

In Homer the woodworker (τέκτων) owes his knowledge (εἰδῇ) of all *sophia* (πάσης σοφίης) to Athena (*Il.* 15. 411–412). No metaphor is involved. However, when Pindar pays compliment to earlier poets as τέκτονες σοφοί of the reputations of men (*P.* 3. 113), there is an implicit acknowledgment that the trait as exhibited by the craftsmen had seniority, and the phraseology becomes metaphorical. Clearly, Pindar, unlike Euripides, did not put much effort into investigating exactly what artists and architects do. In this realm generic language and ideas were sufficient for his purposes and without doubt he exploited these to maximum effect. In this spirit Pausanias (10. 5. 8) records a verse attributing to Olen the first oracular utterance at Delphi, calling him the first to "fashion (τεκτάνατ') a song of ancient verses." Early evidence of actual craftsman's σοφία is found in an Archaic inscription from the Athenian acropolis (*IG* I³ 766), most likely a dedication by a handworker: [Ἐσθλὸν] τοῖσι σοφοῖσι σο[φ]ίζεσθ[αι κ]ατ[ὰ τέχνην]· / [ὃς γὰρ] ἔχει τέχνην, λῶι[ο]ν' ἔχ[ει βίοτον] ("[It is well] for skilled craftsmen to display their ingenuity according to their craft, for he who possesses a craft possesses a better [life]"),[252] and in Herodotus (7. 23. 3), where the Phoenicians are singled out for their expertise (σοφίην) in constructing a canal. Another inscription from the acropolis on the preserved foot of an otherwise missing vase, dating from sometime after 480 BC, alludes to the makers of the object in these same terms: ἄνδρες ἐποίεσαν σοφίαισιν καλὸν ἄγαλμα ("[These] men made a lovely *agalma* by means of their skills," *IG* I² 522 [as *fictile*, not included in *IG* I³]).

All the while that metaphors for it were seen fit to be drawn from the humbler visual arts and crafts, there can be no doubt that the artistry of the poet was an activity that was regarded as a higher calling than other forms of artisanship. Not least that prestige was due to the assumption

---

[251] Cf. Stanford, *Aristophanes. The Frogs*, p. 169; Murray, "Poetic Inspiration," pp. 98–99.

[252] I adopt the text and trans., with modifications, of Paul Friedländer and Herbert B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse From the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (London and Berkeley, 1948), no. 134; cf. *CEG*, # 230. For the date: "perhaps *ante* 500 BC" (Immerwahr, *Attic Script*, p. 124, n. 65); "ca. 500–480?" (*CEG*, p. 122).

that the poet's art was divinely guided by the Muses in a far more direct way than ever Athena or Hephaistos guided the artisans.[253] Granted, I may stand fairly accused of oversimplifying a complex subject. However, for the present purposes, it may be assumed that, while the various craft skills were regarded as "gifts" of Athena and Hephaistos, the artisan is more directly responsible for what he produces with these gifts. The poet is but a conduit of the Muses. Poetry was simply "making" (ποίησις), as Socrates would explain (Pl. *Sym.* 205c), in a purer and more abstract form than any of the visual arts—all other forms of "making" have more specific designations, perhaps in part because they require far more tools of the trade to produce than do writing or singing. At some point, however, a "wise" or practiced hand, as expressed in any number of varying formulations, irrespective of whether one actually used one's hands to do one's making, served as the basis for production of all kinds, including poetry, and inspiration from without came to be regarded with skepticism in the face of the exhibited evidence of knowledge and craftsmanship attained through rigorous training and practice (cf. Plato's *Ion*). The craftsman, at least, unlike the "inspired" poet, could provide a λόγος of how his ἔργον came to be.

Euripides' younger contemporary, Democritus of Abdera, who may have visited Athens (DK 68B116) seems to have regarded poetry, as Andrew Ford well puts it, "as a purely human contrivance to meet human needs."[254] In this he may reflect rather than dictate the status quo. Whether Plato's Ion in the eponymous dialogue represents a real late fifth-century person or a reflection of an obsolete stereotype does not matter; it is clear from Socrates' subjection of this naïve rhapsode, whose confidence in inspiration as the source of his admittedly interpretive art harked back to an earlier time, to some of the most entertaining and light-hearted ridicule in literature, that inspiration as a driving force in

---

[253] The topic has been much debated; for the opposite point of view, see Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, pp. 62–69, with summaries of earlier literature. On the status of the artist/artisan, see, e.g., Philipp, op. cit., pp. 70–100, for a generally positive view for the fifth century; Gentili, *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*, pp. 162–165, esp. on the socio-economic differences between the verbal and visual art professions, and Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, pp. 69–72. Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, pp. 11–18, also reviews this material.

[254] Ford, *The Origins of Criticism*, p. 146, who points to DK 68B144, which articulates, for the first time, "a very important distinction between arts that have their origin in necessity ... and those that, like music, arise only when a condition of surplus has arisen"; DK 68B59, 182 might also be cited in support of this view; however, compare DK 68B18, where ἐνθουσιασμός and ἱεροῦ πνεῦμα are regarded as essential for poetic beauty.

the arts had had its day by the time Plato wrote, and likely by the time Socrates found himself in the business of corrupting the youth of Athens. The reason is fairly certain. The success of the Sophists had taught Classical Greeks once and for all that skills were something to acquire, and that they were for the most part acquirable (often for a fee), that, in order to be a poet, for instance, one did not have to wait patiently in some Arcadian locale for the Muses' favor to manifest itself. Since it was no longer a gift from the Muses, poetry along with its practitioners could be censored and banned—without divine consequence—in Plato's utopian society. All of this is to say that, in the Athens of Socrates and Euripides, the poet, the artist, and the artisan, alike, all looked within for the source for their "inspired" productions. As had always been the case with artisans, these new poets learned a skill; they did not beg a divinity to be rendered a temporary medium for social entertainment. The activity of making, whether poetry, carpentry, or the fine art of sculpture, was in the later fifth century a profoundly humanistic activity, based on training and knowledge, with a fair dose of the right "nature" (φύσις), in other words, inborn capacity, according to thinkers like Democritus.[255] (It might have taken until Callistratos [*Stat.* 2] for inspiration to return to the mix, now in a positive sense [τὸν ἐνθυσιασμὸν τῆς τέχνης], and this time associated with the visual arts, specifically, the making of a sculpture, the famous Bacchante by Scopas.[256]) Once artists are officially autonomous creators, it is a mere step from there to Hellenistic doctrines, as reflected in the critical treatise *On the Sublime*, which privilege the creative imagination as the driving force of artistic activity,[257] a romantic illusion that persists to this day.

In the φύσις ("nature") versus τέχνη ("teachable skill") debate that long occupied ancient thought,[258] there can be no doubt that the artisans found themselves squarely on the side of τέχνη. That is one reason why they served as such useful fodder for analogy for Plato/Socrates. For there can be no art without craftsmanship, no craftsmanship without technical know-how, and that know-how is a form of knowledge (there is no need to engage the complex Platonic/Socratic debate on this issue

---

[255] Ford, *The Origins of Criticism*, pp. 170–171, with sources.

[256] Moshe Barasch, *Theories of Art From Plato to Winckelmann* (New York and London, 1985), pp. 32–33, believes that Callistratus is "the first, and actually the only, classical author who explicitly attributes inspiration to the sculptor."

[257] Verdenius, "The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism," pp. 31, 46, and 55.

[258] See, recently, Spisak, "Callimachean Poetics Revalued," esp. pp. 294–296.

to make a relatively simple point). Yet the acquisition of that knowledge requires substantial intellectual investment, and yes, aptitude (φύσις), which is not often granted to folks who work with their hands. In late Republican Rome Cicero understands this fully when (*Acad.* 2. 146) he argues that Pheidias and Zeuxis (pointedly, an example each of a great sculptor and a great painter) were in possession of real mind knowledge (*scientia*). In Plato's *Cratylus* (414b–c) Socrates devises an etymology for *technê*—however tortured and ironically intended—that denotes "in possession of *nous*" (ἕξιν νοῦ). Prometheus steals from Hephaistos and Athena, along with fire, "artistic wisdom" (τὴν ἔντεχνον σοφίαν) at Plato's *Protagoras* 321c–d. In Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (1. 4. 2–3) Socrates asks Aristodemos which men he admires for their *sophia*. All of those named in response are either poets or artists, in this order: Homer for epic, Melanippides for dithyramb, Sophocles for tragedy, Polykleitos for sculpture, and Zeuxis for painting. Later (*Mem.* 4. 2. 33) Socrates observes that Minos had seized Daidalos διὰ τὴν σοφίαν ("on account of his wisdom"); it is well to recall that Socrates—the wisest of men, and the son of a stoneworker—considered himself, even if tongue-in-cheek, a descendent of Daidalos (Pl. *Euthphr.* 11c).

That *sophia* in the arts in general is regarded favorably in Euripides as an outcome of intellectual activity, in the case of the visual arts, channeled both literally and figuratively through the hands, seems certain.[259] Passages which contrast mental with physical capabilities, valuing more highly the former, lend support to this assertion. Granted, to contrast intelligence with bodily strength, usually of athletes, is something of a *topos* in Greek thought,[260] but Euripides provides more, and more nuanced variations on the theme than any other author. We have already encountered the scornful assessment of the ineffectuality of beautiful athletes in fr. 282. 10–11 (*Autolykos*): λαμπροὶ δ' ἐν ἥβῃ καὶ πόλεως ἀγάλ-

---

[259] Cf. Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus*, p. 168, commenting upon *sophia* in *Ba.*, which he identifies as Euripides' own: "We must … enlarge the concept of the *sophia* which shaped the play, defining it as that combination of intelligence and sensitive sympathy which enabled the poet to grasp the phenomena with which he was dealing and to embody them in a work of art. The play is more than an exhibition of technical skill, it is a revelation; and it is the *sophia* of Euripides, regarded as insight and understanding, that has made this revelation possible."

[260] E.g., S. fr. 939 (*TrGF* 4); cf. Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, p. 125, who supplies additional examples, commenting on the possibly spurious lines, *El.* 386–390, where the contrast is rather fulsomely expressed. In his treatment of E. fr. 282, Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 571–572, compares pre-Socratic thinking along these same lines.

ματα / φοιτῶσ᾽ ("they flit about, gorgeous in their youth, the *agalmata* of the city"). Two additional fragments confront the issue with particular forcefulness: ἀεὶ γὰρ ἄνδρα σκαιὸν ἰσχυρὸν φύσει / ἧσσον δέδοικα τἀσθενοῦς τε καὶ σοφοῦ ("I am always less afraid of a stupid man who is naturally strong than a weak wise one," fr. 290 [*Bell.*]). While χειρός itself does not appear, its presence may be inferred in the choice of the adjective σκαιός, which is a metaphorical term for "stupid," meaning literally "left-handed" (LSJ, s. v. i, as in Homer, where χειρός is meant to be supplied), and therefore for Euripides, a single-word antonym for a "wise" hand. By comparison Sophocles expresses the same contrast using more standard, and significantly less nuanced language: γνῶμαι πλέον κρατοῦσιν ἢ σθένος χερῶν ("Intelligence is more powerful than strength of hands," fr. 939 [*TrGF* 4]). Euripides gives the strong hand/weak mind formula another airing in fr. 842 (*Chrysippus*), where in typical Euripidean fashion, physical beauty—or lack thereof—is added to the equation: †γνώμη σοφός μοι† καὶ χέρ᾽ ἀνδρείαν ἔχων / δύσμορφος εἴην μᾶλλον ἢ καλὸς κακός ("I would rather be ugly, while having a manly hand and wise judgment than be fine to look at, with bad judgment [and weakness of hand]").[261] In this case, and more applicable to the present purposes, the "strong hand" and the "wisdom" occur together, while the ellipsis καλὸς κακός allows *mutatis mutandis* for the supplying of the opposites in all three categories. Artisans were frequently portrayed as humble, homely in appearance, short, hunched, and balding men well past their prime. Thus this very formula for the preferred type, homeliness, along with strength or "character" (ἀνδρείαν) of hand and intelligence, in short, a "wise hand," might just as easily characterize the artisans in the passages with which we began.

An especially vivid illustration in support of Euripides' high regard for *sophia* in the fine arts may be found in the fragmentary play *Antiope*.[262] In it the twin sons of Zeus and Antiope debate the relative virtues of their respective life styles by way of a dramatic *agôn* in which Zethus attempts to persuade Amphion to abandon music and take up more practical matters. This *agôn* is brought up as a *locus classicus* for the debate on the active versus the contemplative life, at the center of which

261 The daggered portion of Kannicht's text is grammatically problematic, but the sense I think is clear.

262 The fragments are conveniently collected and edited, with translation and commentary, by Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, pp. 259–325; see now also Collard and Cropp, *Euripides*, 7.

Socrates found himself, in Plato's *Gorgias* 484c–486d.[263] Amphion, a gifted musician, attempts to counter his more pragmatic brother Zethus' claim that the practice of music cannot be σοφός, since it is an art that takes a physically well-endowed (εὐφυᾶ) man and renders him inferior (fr. 186). The two contest the matter at some length and, though their exchange is unfortunately fragmented, Amphion appears to be the loser. However, when Hermes, who gave Amphion his lyre in the first place,[264] appears *ex machina* at the end of the play (fr. 223. 90–95), the god in effect reverses the apparent verdict of the *agôn* by pronouncing that the mighty walls of Thebes are to be built by Amphion, to the magical accompaniment of his lyre music.[265] Earlier we discussed how Euripides might have been the innovator of this charming story.

Noteworthy for the present purposes is that, throughout the brothers' exchange in *Antiope*, Amphion's art and his habit of contemplation are repeatedly associated with σοφός and related language, and Zethus' not at all. At fr. 199 Amphion argues that, in spite (or because) of his unimpressive, "effeminate" physique, he is the one who is capable of sound thinking (εὖ φρονεῖν ἔχω). Zethus had earlier taunted him that he would at best "seem sensible" (δόξεις φρονεῖν) only if he "sings the tune" of hard work (fr. 188). At fr. 202 Amphion claims that, compared to the overfed and dull-witted athletes, a man of his inclinations would make the better citizen, since he could "sing and say something *sophos*" without stirring up trouble in the city. Amphion further argues that "one wise counsel" (σοφὸν ... ἓν βούλευμα) from a properly contemplative man can override the unwise preferences of the masses in political assembly (fr. 200). Even when Zethus scathingly refers to Amphion's brainy pursuits as τὰ κομψὰ ... σοφίσματα (loosely, "too clever skills"[266]), in spite of the intended pejorative sense, his phraseology incorporates a form of *sophos* (fr. 188).

What becomes clear from the story in Euripides' hands is that music —and by implication, the arts in general, the "fine things" (τῶν καλῶν),

---

[263] See, further, Andrea W. Nightingale, "Plato's *Gorgias* and Euripides' *Antiope*: A Study in Generic Transformation," *Classical Antiquity* 11 (1992), 121–141; Dodds, *Plato Gorgias*, pp. 273–276. For a recent consideration of the debate, see Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, pp. 266–268, and following commentary.

[264] See p. 93, above.

[265] Cf. Nightingale, "Plato's *Gorgias* and Euripides' *Antiope*," p. 130; Dodds, *Plato Gorgias*, p. 276; N. Wecklein, "Die Antiope des Euripides," *Philologus* 79 (1924), 51–69 (58–62).

[266] Cf. Collard in Collard, Cropp, and Gibert, p. 304.

as they are called by Amphion (fr. 198)—give a man surer access to wisdom than the more traditionally masculine pursuits that require a beautiful fit body, such as warfare and athletics (though the sculptor may be fit, he is definitely not beautiful). And even more radically, Euripides has it that cities are better run and managed by contemplative types than by the physically more powerful athletes and warriors. Moreover, by aligning the musical arts with the handicraft of masonry in a captivating but nonetheless eccentric myth, with one man (albeit half divine) managing miraculously to demonstrate a high level of competence in both arenas, Euripides succeeds in his message of ascribing *sophos* to both the more "sedentary" (or, perhaps more accurately, peripatetic) and "cerebral" of the arts and those that require strenuous physical labor to produce their particular life-enhancing beauties, but may be no less cerebral for it. This would amount, in the case of the former, which had always enjoyed high, if occasionally questionable, status, to a mere reaffirmation of this status, whereas in the case of the latter, to a fairly dramatic elevation in status, by fifth-century standards. Kurtz would see the *agôn* of *Antiope* as evidence that the modern notion of "art for art's sake" was beginning to take hold, and that these are indeed the sentiments of Euripides, himself, who was already living this life ("der sein Leben weitgehend mit der Kunst und für die Kunst gelebt hat"). Kurtz compares the chorus at *HF* 673–686, who express their unabashed pride in a life devoted to art.[267] Similar are the sentiments of the chorus at *Alc.* 962–963.

For Euripides, writing in the latter half of the fifth century, unselfconsciously allowing that artisans are σοφοί is then, both somewhat archaistic in the age of the Sophists, those professional teachers of a range of skills which involved the intellect, not the hands, and looks forward to the fourth century, the age of the philosophers. It amounts to high praise for banausic activities that are traditionally looked down upon in ancient thought, leading directly to the nervousness about the mimetic arts as a whole that plagued Plato. In the first half of the century the visual arts, especially sculpture, were fertile ground for metaphors that flattered and ennobled the verbal arts. Euripides was having none of it. There is no hint of the *paragone* debate in Euripides; there, the arts are equals. A reputation for empathy with artisanal activities and their practitioners may have something to do with the way that the tragedian is parodied in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, where metaphor upon metaphor describes his verbiage as

[267] Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, pp. 596–597.

chiseled, honed, shaved, smoothed, ruled, and squared, even though it is Aeschylus who emerges as "sophos" from their match-up (*Ra.* 1413, 1434, 1519).[268] Whether Euripides is a man of his time or an anomaly, whether he looks backward or forward, there can be no doubt that, by the later fifth century, the visual arts and crafts had attained, from the point of view of *sophia*, virtual equity with the verbal,[269] enough to encourage Socrates to visit artists' studios confident that he would encounter agreeable and intellectually provocative conversation among adult men with dust and pigment on their short, one-shouldered chitons, and callouses on their hands. For the Sophists had taught the Athenians, if only inadvertently, a valuable lesson: *Sophia* was something earned, and to be respected, in whatever quarters it was encountered.

Conclusion

Euripides' habitual adoption of language associated with the ideas and actualities behind art and artistry, crafts and craftsmanship, testifies even more pointedly than does Plato's *Ion*, which may or may not be historically accurate, to a turn of tide in the second half of the fifth century. For there is little of the divine at work in the language and imagery we have examined in this study. Rather, it is vigorously human and often quite mundane, in origin and intent, the result, or so I have speculated, of a firsthand acquaintance with working craftsmen's ways and means—οἰκεῖα πράγματα, by any other name. In its unapologetic everydayness Euripides' language of craft offers supporting evidence for the playwright's much touted realism. More importantly, it calls attention to Euripides' modernity. That, by the later fifth century, the visual arts and crafts had achieved, from the point of view of σοφία, virtual equity with the verbal, begs the question: Would a painter, sculptor, carpenter, or architect have been invited to a symposium? We cannot know; the only two dramatizations of these ubiquitous occasions which are preserved include none. Yet it is entirely feasible that the symposium provided a context in which Euripides might have encountered real-life artists and builders whose informed conversation supplied

[268] Cf. Spisak, "Callimachean Poetics Revalued," p. 295.
[269] Cf. Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 100.

him with a level of knowledge of the arts and crafts suitable for ready deployment in his plays. An alternative, while we are imagining, is that the artists held their own symposia and Euripides was happy to join them. Either way, this most intellectually inclined of the classical dramatists would hardly have overlooked an opportunity to learn something. In this he would have been Socrates' opposite, which begins to suggest why we have so little evidence of contact between the two men. Euripides was not a philosopher.[270] He was not a Sophist. A dilettante? He was the most humane of playwrights, a master at portraying the human condition, a monumental enterprise which would have been unthinkable for one who knows nothing.

[270] Cf. Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 641.

EPILOGUE

Some consistent patterns have emerged in the preceding pages, which may be briefly summarized before concluding our investigation with some final thoughts on its significance for students of Euripides. Curiously, little of the language that I have identified as "artisanal" in Euripides turns up also in Aristophanes, where one might legitimately expect overlap. In the late fifth century the two were regarded as so close in artistic temperament that the comedian Cratinus was inspired to coin a verb, εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων, in apparent acknowledgment, as E.W. Handley deduces, of Aristophanes as "a smart young man, tarred with the same brush of intellectualism as Euripides."[1] The scholium that preserves the fragment (*PCG* 4 342) suggests that it relates to Aristophanes' habit of mocking Euripides by imitating him. If so he managed to do it by respecting the spirit rather than the letter of Euripidean vocabulary. Though technical and "everyday," the language under consideration in this study does not often cross the line between tragic and comic diction.

A significant portion of this language, it will have been noted, falls under the headings, "rare" or "rare usage." The *hapax* is not at all unusual. Technically inflected words adopted by Euripides are frequently paralleled in inscriptions, typically those related to building projects, and on occasion, seldom or not at all elsewhere. This is especially true, as we have seen, in the case of architectural language. Literary parallels, when found, tend to cluster in prose rather than in poetry.[2] Among prose writers who also have use for this terminology, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, where parallels would most likely be expected, are infrequently found, but in their stead, later writers of scholia, grammars, commentaries, lexica, and other scholarly works in the Alexandrine tradition, many of which are in fact motivated to explain the use of an unfamiliar

---

[1] E.W. Handley, "Comedy," in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, I, 2: *Greek Drama*, eds. P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox (Cambridge, Eng., 1989), pp. 103–173 (127, with n. 1).

[2] So also Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 642, speaking in general of E.'s imagery, concludes that it is "oftmals nicht eigentlich dichterisch." This conclusion is borne out as well if one consults the entries for the terms discussed in Chapter One in Anastasios K. Orlandos and John. N. Travlos, ΛΕΧΙΚΟΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ ΑΡΧΙΤΕΚΤΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΟΡΩΝ (Athens, 1986).

term in Euripides. Much of the technical and art critical language presented in Chapter Five is also found in Plato, less often in Aristotle, again, what would seem the more likely milieu. One wonders whether Euripides knew Socrates better than our evidence indicates. It is well to recall that Socrates, too, was accused of introducing the equivalent of οἰκεῖα πράγματα in his arguments.[3]

As for poetic parallels, Euripides' artisinal language turns up most often in Homer and Pindar, but then again in neither poet nearly as often as we might expect. It quite frequently turns up in the *AP* or the *APl*, often in cases where there is no other poetic parallel, again raising the possibility of Euripides' being its innovator. Most significantly, it very often is not paralleled in the extant works of either Aeschylus or Sophocles, and in the latter, perhaps least of all. Euripides is clearly not borrowing from the conventional sources. Whatever its origins, whether inscriptions, craftsmen's treatises, other specialized prose, or simply shop talk, Euripides makes images out of technically inspired language over and over again, and it becomes unmistakably poetic in his hands. His ability to forage for language in out-of-the-way places and transform the mundane attests to the tragedian's originality and begins to account for the difficulties that later commentators, both ancient and modern, have had in explaining Euripides' lexical repertoire. It also helps account for why he has been and continues to be a challenging author.

Finally, a few reflections about what have we learned, or had reinforced, about Euripides the playwright by exploring his language of craft. First, that he is a man of his times, no less a modernist, to be sure, than his coevals, Socrates and the Sophists. Like them, he was an old comedian's dream-come-true. I need not enter into the great controversy of his alleged atheism to stake the claim that Euripides has never been regarded as traditionalist or conservative in his thinking. This study has shown that a significant segment of his language tends also toward the non-traditional. While Euripides obviously revered Homer and respected and occasionally emulated Aeschylus, his worldview resembled neither's. (Nor even does it seem he had much in common, intellectually or socially, with his immediate competitor, Sophocles.) Aeschylus, whose proudest achievement was his participation in the battle of Marathon, looked backward to the late Archaic world; his portrayal by Aristophanes in *Frogs* presumes an audience who under-

---

[3] E.g. *Grg.* 482e, φορτικὰ καὶ δημηγορικά; *Sym.* 221e–222a.

stood and accepted this. Euripides, on the other hand, is a man of the far more sobering Peloponnesian war years. When a war is as protracted as that, as we know from modern experience, morale and public support deteriorates and visions of victory in a blaze of glory must be abandoned. His outlook, serious, questioning, and unsatisfied, is thoroughly modern, for his own or any other time. Not surprisingly, Euripides was labeled μισογέλως ("laughter-hating") in antiquity.[4] Meanwhile, Sophocles, contrary to expectations, given his reputation for extroversion and his active political career, is altogether less responsive to the environment in which both poets lived and practiced their art, or at least of its material aspects.

Second, that Euripides is a realist, in every sense. Not for him the world of appearances, which can lead a well-intentioned individual inexorably into tragedy. There is no better demonstration of this than his preoccupation with the representation of character, as treated at length in Chapter Three. In the final analysis, a determined, but ultimately vain search for a foolproof method of insight into character squares perfectly with what we know otherwise of Euripides, who faced criticism and ridicule at the hands of contemporaries for his unorthodox and, in many ways, insufficiently "tragic" tendencies in style and plot. (S.H. Butcher observes that Aristotle in *Poetics* mentions Euripides some twenty times, "in the great majority of instances with censure."[5]) This would include his preference for language and images that lend themselves readily to straightforward interpretation, as well as his habits of presenting unpretentious characters, sometimes in rags, on stage in a forthright manner, and finding enlightenment and humor in the unlikeliest of persons and situations—in short, for being keen to expose his audiences to the way people and things really are, even if it means overturning conventions and expectations to a degree his fellow Athenians were more accustomed to expect in their comedy. Euripides, to judge from the views and behavior of his characters, would rather see the truth for what it is and meet it head-on, no matter how ugly or intractable. This realism in high art, though hardly unprecedented, was "new" and "shocking" in the late fifth century BC, just as it would be "new" and "shocking" again in nineteenth-century France. The question persists: Why is realism in art so disturbing? Perhaps because life itself can be disturbing and disquieting, and the fine

---

[4] Alex. Aet., *Mousai*, fr. 7. 2 (Iohannes U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* [Oxford, 1925]); Halliwell, *Greek Laughter*, pp. 168 and 270–271.

[5] Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 225.

arts are more typically viewed as a means of retreat from it. However, for moderns like Euripides, art offers a unique opportunity for engagement rather than an escape.

That realism of outlook extended to Euripides' portrayal of the world in his unabashedly worldly dramas. Evidence of an attention to the visually provocative built, sculptured, and painted environment in which he lived his long life asserts itself in major and as well as minor keys in Euripides' plays. In this study we have not shunned the opportunity to reexamine the ekphrases, those showpieces that rival the art works or artifacts, real or imaginary, that they purport to describe. However, it is not by means of grand gestures, but rather less obtrusive, momentary encounters with the material world that Euripides shows his mettle as a craftsman of language. For the devotion to realism, which saturated his idiom and apparently his outlook, is most apparent in the easy-to-overlook "Morellian" details that constitute the bulk of the evidence just presented. As it turns out, ancient attitudes toward the visual arts are inclined to reveal themselves in those very same Morellian details; thus the enterprise of prying them loose from the text can be said to offer a double reward for the diligent student of the Classical Greek milieu and mindset.

Third, that, as a poet, he is a Keats to Aeschylus' Shelley. Having immersed myself in the works of Euripides in preparing the present study, I have come to believe that, great poet that he is, the truest and best of this playwright may be discovered in his prosaic, as it were, rather than his poetic language. I think Aristophanes had him right. He is not a lofty artist. His images cannot be said to match for sheer spectacle those of his predecessor, Aeschylus, but they are sincere and to the point, and we understand them because he wants us to.[6] There is more than a little irony in the assertion that a playwright used technical terminology, in some cases quite rarified, to make himself clear. That he was able to do so testifies to an unusual time when such matters were common currency, rather than the exclusive province of specialist practitioners. When the

[6] Cf. the summary comments of Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise*, p. 379, who further explores the influence of A's. upon E.'s imagery through comparative examples, pp. 395–423. Müller, *Handwerk und Sprache*, p. 328, also notes the differences in complexity and "difficulty" between the two poets' images in this category; however, I cannot agree with his conclusions that E.'s images, though more numerous, are repetitive, his metaphors seldom fully sustained. As Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides*, p. 62, says of messenger speeches in E.: "it is precisely because we can visualize it so clearly that we can believe it."

hoi polloi were regulars of the theater and participants in the government. When artist and poet were closer in stature and status than ever before, prefiguring modernity. When a wise man like Socrates visited the studios of artisans and asked them what they were doing and why, and was left in deep thought by their answers. When the Sophists roamed Athens peddling artfully crafted, image-laden speechifying techniques.[7] When the language of craft was a language of both the intellectual elite and the man in the street. When great art and literature were of the people, and a daily affair.

[7] Cf. the summary remarks of Philipp, *Tektonon Daidala*, p. 41, concerning the prominent role the visual arts played in late-fifth century thought.

WORKS CITED

Adam, Sheila. 1966. *The Technique of Greek Sculpture in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Oxford.

Adler, Ada. 1928–1938. *Suidae Lexicon*. Leipzig.

Aktseli, Dimitra. 1996. *Altäre in der archaischen und klassischen Kunst: Untersuchungen zu Typologie und Ikonographie*, (Internationale Archäologie) 28. Espelkamp.

Allan, William. 2001. *Euripides. The Children of Heracles*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.

———. 2008. *Euripides Helen*. Cambridge, Eng.

Allen, Thomas W. and E.E. Sikes. 1904. *The Homeric Hymns*. London.

Amouretti, Marie-Claire. 2000. "L'artisanat indispensable au fonctionnement de l'agriculture." In *L'Artisanat en Grèce Ancienne: Les productions, les diffusions*. Francine Blondé and Arthur Muller, eds. Paris: 147–164.

Anderson, Michael J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford.

Arafat, K.W. 1996. *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*. Cambridge, Eng.

Archibald, Zophia H. 1998. *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace. Orpheus Unmasked*. Oxford.

Arnold, Dieter. 1991. *Building in Egypt. Pharaonic Stone Masonry*. Oxford.

Arnott, Peter. 1962. *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B. C.* Oxford.

Austin, Colin. 1968. *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta*. Berlin.

Austin, Colin and S. Douglas Olson. 2004. *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*. Oxford.

Austin, Norman. 1994. *Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom*. Ithaca, NY.

Avramidou, Amalia. 2006. "Attic Vases in Etruria: Another View on the Divine Banquet Cup by the Codrus Painter." *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 565–579.

Bäbler, Balbina. 2001. "Die archaischen attischen Grabstelen in der themistokleischen Stadtmauer: Grabschändung oder Apotropaion?" *Philologus* 145: 3–15.

Bacon, Helen H. 1961. *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy*. New Haven.

Barasch, Moshe. 1985. *Theories of Art From Plato to Winckelmann*. New York and London.

Barber, E.J.W. 1991. *Prehistoric Textiles*. Princeton.

———. 1992. "The Peplos of Athena." In Neils 1992: 103–117.

Barkova, Ludmila. 1999. "The Pazyryk—Fifty Years On." *Hali* 107: 64–69.

Barlow, Shirley A. 1971. *The Imagery of Euripides. A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language*. London.

———. 1986. *The Imagery of Euripides. A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language*. 2nd ed. Bristol.

———. 1996. *Euripides Heracles*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.

———. 1997 [1986]. *Euripides Trojan Women*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
Barrett, W.S. 1992 [1964]. *Euripides Hippolytos*. Oxford.
Bassi, Karen. 1993. "Helen and the Discourse of Denial in Stesichorus' Palinode." *Arethusa* 26: 51–75.
Battezzato, Luigi. 2000. "Pragmatica e retorica delle frasi interrogative in Euripide. Note ai fr. 125 e 255 Nauck e ad Andr. 366 s. (con una parentesi sul fr. 172 Nauck)." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 44: 141–173.
Beard, Mary. 2003. "Mrs. Arthur Strong, Morelli, and the Troopers of Cortés." In *Ancient Art and its Historiography*. A.A. Donohue and Mark D. Fullerton, eds. Cambridge, Eng.: 148–170.
Benedetto, V. di. 1971. "Il rinnovamento stylistico della lirica dell'ultimo euripide e la contemporanea arte figurativa." *Dionisio* 45: 326–333.
Berger, Ernst. 1990. "Zum Kanon des Polyklet." In Kreikenbom: 156–184.
———. 1992. *Der Entwurf des Künstlers. Bildhauerkanon in der Antike und Neuzeit*. Basel.
Bergk, Theodorus. 1882. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, 3. Leipzig.
Berve, Helmut and Gottfried Gruben. [n. d.] *Greek Temples, Theatres and Shrines*. New York.
Bethe, Erich. 1997 [1900–1937]. *Pollucis Onomasticon*, (Lexicographi Graeci) 9. Stuttgart.
Bettini, Maurizio. 1999. *The Portrait of the Lover*. (Trans. Laura Gibbs.) Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Biehl, Werner. 1989. *Euripides Troades*. Heidelberg.
Blomfield, C.J. 1826 [1813]. "Animadversiones quaedam in Euripidis Supplices et Iphigenias." *Museum Criticum* 1: 181–193.
———. 1839 [1823]. *Aeschyli Agamemnon*. 5th ed. London.
Bluemel, Carl. 1969 [1927]. *Greek Sculptors at Work*. (Trans. Lydia Holland and rev. by Betty Ross.) 2nd Eng. ed. London.
Blumenthal, Albrecht von. 1928. "ΤΥΠΟΣ und ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ." *Hermes* 63: 391–414.
Boardman, John. 1974. *Athenian Black Figure Vases*. New York.
———. 1978. "Exekias." *American Journal of Archaeology* 82: 11–25.
———. 1983. *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Archaic Period*. London.
———. 1985. *Greek Sculpture. The Classical Period*. London.
———. 1989. *Athenian Red Figure Vases. The Classical Period*. London.
———. 1991. *Greek Sculpture. The Archaic Period*. London.
———. 1998. *Early Greek Vase Painting*. London.
Boedeker, Deborah. 1997. "Becoming Medea: Assimilation in Euripides." In *Medea. Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*. James J. Clauss and Sarah. I. Johnston, eds. Princeton: 127–148.
Boegehold, Alan L. 1989. "A Signifying Gesture: Euripides, *Iphigeneia Taurica*, 965–966." *American Journal of Archaeology* 93: 81–83.
———. 1995. *The Athenian Agora, Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 28: *The Lawcourts at Athens*. Princeton.
Bolling, G.M. 1958. "*Poikilos* and *Throna*." *American Journal of Philology* 79: 275–282.

Bond, Godfrey W. 1981. *Euripides Heracles*. Oxford.
Bondanella, Julia C. and Peter Bondanella. 1998. *Giorgio Vasari. The Lives of the Artists*. Oxford and New York.
Bongers, B.J.J.M. 2002. "Euripides *Bacchae* 1064–9: Dionysus, the Wheel and the Lathe." *Mnemosyne* 55: 83–87.
Borbein, Adolf H. 1996. "Polykleitos." In Palagia and Pollitt: 66–90.
Bothmer, Dietrich von. 1985. *The Amasis Painter and his World. Vase-Painting in Sixth-Century BC Athens*. Malibu, CA.
Bötticher, Karl. 1852. *Die Tektonik der Hellenen*. 2 vols. Potsdam.
Boulter, Patricia N. 1969. "The Akroteria of the Nike Temple." *Hesperia* 38: 133–140.
Breitenbach, Wilhelm. 1934. *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideische Lyrik*. Stuttgart.
Bremer, J.M. 1975. "The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*." *Mnemosyne* 28: 268–280.
Bremmer, Jan. 1980. "An Enigmatic Indo-European Rite: Paederasty." *Arethusa* 13: 279–298.
Brinkmann, Vinzenz. 2003. *Die Polychromie der archaischen und frühklassischen Skulptur*. Munich.
Brommer, Frank. 1967. *Die Metopen des Parthenon*. 2 vols. Mainz.
———. 1986. *Heracles. The Twelve Labors of the Hero in Ancient Art and Literature*. (Trans. and enlarged by Shirley J. Schwarz.) New Rochelle, NY.
Brown, A.L. 1984. "Three and Scene-Painting Sophocles." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 210 (n. s. 30): 1–17.
Bruneau, Philippe. 1962. "Ganymède et l'Aigle: Images, Caricatures et Parodies Animales du Rapt." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 86: 193–228.
Bruno, Vincent J. 1977. *Form and Color in Greek Painting*. New York.
Buitron-Oliver, Diana, ed. 1997. *The Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome*, (Studies in the History of Art) 49, (Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, Symposium Papers) 29. Hannover, NH, and London.
Bull, George. 1965. *Giorgio Vasari. The Lives of the Artists*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Eng.
Burford, Alison. 1969. *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros*. Toronto.
———. 1972. *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*. Ithaca, NY.
Burian, Peter. 1999. "Melos or Bust: Reading the *Trojan Women* Historically." *American Philological Association Abstracts*: 90.
Burke, Richard B. 1997. "Textile Production at Gordion and the Phrygian Economy." *American Journal of Archaeology* 101: 361 [abstract].
Burkert, Walter. 1995 [1992]. *The Orientalizing Revolution. Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. (Trans. Margaret E. Pinder and Walter Burkert.) Cambridge, MA, and London.
Burn, Lucilla. 1987. *The Meidias Painter*. Oxford.
———. 1991. *The British Museum Book of Greek and Roman Art*. London.
Burnett, Anne P. 1970. *Ion by Euripides*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
———. 1977. "*Trojan Women* and the Ganymede Ode." *Yale Classical Studies* 25: 291–316.

Bury, R.G. 1932. *The Symposium of Plato*. Cambridge, Eng.
Butcher, S.H. 1951. *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. New York.
Cahill, Nicholas. 2002. *Household and City Organization at Olynthos*. New Haven.
Calder III, William M. 1969. "The Date of Euripides' *Erectheus*." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 10: 147–156.
Camp II, John McK. 2000. "Walls and the *Polis*." In *Polis & Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*. Pernille Flensted-Jensen, Thomas Heine Nielsen, and Lene Rubinstein, eds. Copenhagen: 41–57.
Campbell, A.Y. 1950. *Euripides Helena*. Liverpool.
———. 1956. "Notes on Euripides' *Bacchae*." *Classical Quarterly* 50: 56–67.
Campbell, David A. 1982–1988. *Greek Lyric*, 1–2. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Campbell, Lewis. 1881. *Sophocles*. 2 vols. Oxford.
Carey, C. 1977. "Euripides, Andromache 1014–15." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 23: 16.
Carpenter, Rhys. 1929. *The Sculpture of the Nike Temple Parapet*. Cambridge, MA.
Carpenter, Thomas H. 1991. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*. London and New York.
———. 1997. *Dionysian Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens*. Oxford.
Cary, Earnest. 1937–1950. *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. 7 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Caskey, Lacey D. 1905. "Notes on Inscriptions from Eleusis Dealing with the Building of the Porch of Philon." *American Journal of Archaeology* 9: 147–156.
Chadwick, John. 1976. *The Mycenaean World*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1996. *Lexigographica Graeca. Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek*. Oxford.
Chantraine, Pierre. 1968. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots*. Paris.
Childe, V. Gordon. 1965. "Rotary Motion." In *A History of Technology*, 1. Charles Singer, E.J. Holmyard, and A.R. Hall, eds. Oxford: 187–215.
Childs, William A.P. 1978. *The City-Reliefs of Lycia*. Princeton.
———. 1993. "Herodotos, Archaic Chronology, and the Temple of Apollo at Delphi." *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 108: 399–441.
———. 1994. "The Date of the Old Temple of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis." In *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*. W.D.E. Coulson et al., eds. Oxford: 1–6.
Christensen, Jesper. 1999. "Vindicating Vitruvius on the Subject of Perspective." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 119: 161–166.
Clairmont, Christoph W. 1971. "Euripides' *Erechtheus* and the Erechtheion." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 12: 485–495.
Cohen, Beth. 1997. "Divesting the Female Breast of Clothes in Classical Sculpture." In *Naked Truths. Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology*. Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons, eds. New York and London: 66–92.

——. 2006. *The Colors of Clay. Techniques in Athenian Vases*. Los Angeles, CA.
Cohoon, J.W. 1961. *Dio Chrysostom, Discourses*, 2. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Collard, Christopher. 1975. *Euripides Supplices*. 2 vols. Groningen.
——. 1991. *Euripides Hecuba*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
Collard, C., M.J. Cropp, and K.H. Lee, 1995. *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays*, 1. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
——, M.J. Cropp, and J. Gibert. 2004. *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays*, 2. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
——and Martin Cropp. 2008. *Euripides*, 7–8. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition.)
Conacher, D.J. 1988. *Euripides Alcestis*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
Connelly, Joan B. 1996. "Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze." *American Journal of Archaeology* 100: 53–80.
Connor, W.R. 1985. "The Razing of the House in Greek Society." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115: 79–102.
Cousin, G. 1889. "Inscriptions de Iasos et de Bargylia." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 13: 23–40.
——. 1898. "Voyage en Carie." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 22: 361–402.
Craik, Elizabeth. 1988. *Euripides Phoenician Women*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
——. 1990. "Sexual Imagery and Innuendo in *Troades*." In *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*. Anton Powell, ed. London and New York: 1–15.
Croally, N.T. 1994. *Euripidean Polemic: The Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy*. Cambridge, Eng.
Croissant, Francis. 2003. *Les Frontons du Temple du IVᵉ Siècle*, (Fouilles de Delphes) 4, 7. Athens.
Cromey, Robert D. 1991. "History and Image: The Penelope Painter's Akropolis (Louvre G372 and 480/79 BC)." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101: 165–174.
Cropp, M.J. 1988. *Euripides Electra*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
——. 2000. *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
Cropp, Martin and Gordon Fick. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides. The Fragmentary Tragedies*, (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement), 43. London.
Crowley, Janice L. 2008. "Mycenaean Art and Architecture." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*. Cynthia W. Shelmerdine, ed. Cambridge, Eng.: 258–288.
Cruickshank, A.H. 1934 [1893]. *Euripides Bacchae*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
Dale, A.M. 1961. *Euripides Alcestis*. Oxford.
——. 1967. *Euripides Helen*. Oxford.
Davidson, John. 2001. "Homer and Euripides' *Troades*." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 45: 65–79.
Davies, Gilbert A. 1908. *The Trachiniae of Sophocles with a Commentary Abridged from the Larger Edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb, Litt.D.* Cambridge, Eng.
Davies, Malcolm. 1991. *Sophocles Trachiniae*. Oxford.

Davis, Philip H. 1931. *Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions of the Fourth Century Before Christ*. Diss.: Princeton.
Dawe, R.D. 2006 [1982]. *Sophocles Oedipus Rex*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, Eng.
De Cesare, Monica. 1997. *Le statue in imagine. Studi sulle raffigurazioni di statue nella pittura vascolare greca*. Rome.
Denniston, J.D. 1939. *Euripides Electra*. Oxford.
———. 1952 [1934]. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
de Jong, Irene J.F. 1991. *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, and Cologne.
Diggle, James. 1970. *Euripides Phaethon*. Cambridge. Eng.
———. 1974. "On the 'Heracles' and 'Ion' of Euripides." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philologial Society*, n. s. 20: 3–36.
———. 1981. *Studies on the Text of Euripides*. Oxford.
———. 1981–1994. *Euripidis Fabulae*. 3 vols. Oxford.
———. 1998. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta*. Oxford.
———. 1998b. "Euripides, *Bacchae* 1063–1069." *Eikasmos* 9: 41–52.
Dimitriou, Penelope. 1947. *The Polychromy of Greek Sculpture to the Beginning of the Hellenistic Period*. Diss.: Columbia University.
Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1964 [1829]. *Aristides*, 3. Hildesheim.
———. 1835–1838. *Aristophanis Comoediae*. 4 vols. Oxford.
———. 1962 [1851]. *Aeschylus Tragoediae Superstites et Deperditarum Fragmenta*, 3: *Scholia Graeca ex Codicibus Aucta et Emendata*. Hildesheim.
Dinsmoor, William Bell. 1975. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*. New York.
Ditifeci, M.T. 1984. "Note al Telefo di Euripide." *Prometheus* 10: 210–220.
Dodds, E.R. 1959. *Plato Gorgias*. Oxford.
———. 1960 [1944]. *Euripides Bacchae*. Oxford.
Donohue, A.A. 1988. *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture*. Atlanta, GA.
Dörig, José. 1967. "Lesefrüchte." In *Gestalt und Geschichte. Festschrift Karl Schefold*. Martha Rohde-Liegle, Herbert A. Cahn, and H. Chr. Ackermann, eds. Bern.
Dougherty, Carol and Leslie Kurke, eds. 1998. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*. New York and Oxford.
Dover, Kenneth. 1993. *Aristophanes Frogs*. Oxford.
———. 1997. *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*. Oxford.
Drachmann, A.B. 1997 [1903–1927]. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. 3 vols. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Dreyfus, Renée and Ellen Schraudolph. 1996. *Pergamon. The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar*, 1. San Francisco, CA.
Drost, Willi. 1970. "Strrukturwandel der griechischen Kunst im Zeitalter des Euripides." *Gymnasium* 77: 375–391.
Dugas, Charles. 1956. "Observations sur la légende de Persée." *Revue des Études Grecques* 69: 1–15.
Dunbar, Nan. 1995. *Aristophanes Birds*. Oxford.
Dunn, Francis M. 1993. "Beginning at the End in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Rheinisches Museum* 136: 22–35.
Dyck, Andrew R. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*. Ann Arbor, MI.

Dyson, M. and K.H. Lee. 2000. "The Funeral of Astyanax in Euripides' *Troades*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 120: 17–33.
Easterling, P.E. 1985. "Anachronism in Greek Tragedy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105: 1–10.
———. 1989. "City Settings in Greek Poetry." *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 86: 5–17.
Easterling, P.E. and B.M.W. Knox, eds. 1989. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 1, 2: *Greek Drama*. Cambridge, Eng.
Economakis, R. ed. 1994. *Acropolis Restorations. The CCAM Interventions*. London.
Edwards, Charles M. 1996. "Lysippos." In Palagia and Pollitt: 130–153.
Ehrenberg, Victor. 1962. *The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*. New York.
Eiselein, Joseph. 1825–1829. *Johann Winckelmann. Sämtliche Werke*. 12 vols. Donaueschingen.
Ellis, R. 1881. "I. On the Fragments of Sophocles." *American Journal of Philology*: 411–424.
England, E.B. 1950. *The Iphigeneia Among the Tauri of Euripides*. London.
Erbse, Hartmut. 1969–1988. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. 7 vols. Berlin.
———. 1984. *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie*. Berlin.
Fairbanks, Arthur. 1979. *Philostratus the Elder/the Younger Imagines. Callistratus Descriptions*. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Fairweather, Janet. 1974. "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers." *Ancient Society* 5: 231–275.
Falconer, W.A. 1953. *Cicero, De senectute, De amicitia, De divinatione*. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Faraone, Christopher A. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses. Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual*. New York and Oxford.
Feickert, A. 2005. *Euripidis Rhesus. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, (Studien zur Klassische Philologie) 151. Frankfurt.
Fennell, C.A.M. 1879. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. Cambridge, Eng.
Ferrari, Gloria. 2002. *Figures of Speech. Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece*. Chicago and London.
———. 2008. *Alcman and the Cosmos of Sparta*. Chicago and London.
Foley, Helene P. 1992. "*Anodos* Dramas: Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Helen*." In *Innovations of Antiquity*. Ralph J. Hexter and Daniel L. Selden, eds. New York: 133–160.
———. 2003. "The Masque of Dionysus." (rev. vers.) In Mossman 2003: 342–368. (Orig. pub. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110 [1980], 107–133).
Ford, Andrew. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism. Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton and Oxford.
Forrest, W.G. 1960. "Themistocles and Argos." *Classical Quarterly* 10: 221–241.
Fraenkel, Eduard. 1942. "Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 28: 237–258.
———. 1962 [1950]. *Aeschylus Agamemnon*. 3 vols. Oxford.

Frazer, James George. 1913 [1897–1898]. *Pausanias's Description of Greece*. 6 vols. 2nd ed. London.
———. 1967. *Apollodorus. The Library*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Friedländer, Paul, and Herbert B. Hoffleit. 1948. *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse From the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*. London and Berkeley.
Fuchs, Werner. 1959. *Die Vorbilder der neuattischen Reliefs*, (Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Ergänzungsheft) 20. Berlin.
Fuchs, Werner and Thorsten Opper. 2000. "Eine versteckte Huldigung des Euripides an Kallimachos, Bildhauer und Toreut (?)." In *Skenika. Beiträge zum antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Horst-Dieter Blume*. Susanne Gödde and Theodor Heinze, eds. Darmstadt: 189–196.
Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore, MD, and London.
Gellie, George. 1981. "Tragedy and Euripides' *Electra*." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 28: 1–12.
Gentili, Bruno. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*. (Trans. with intro. A. Thomas Cole). Baltimore, MD, and London.
Gildersleeve, Basil L. 1980. *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*. Groningen.
Goff, Barbara. 1988. "Euripides' *Ion* 1132–1165: The Tent." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 34: 42–54.
———. 1988b. "The Shields of *Phoenissae*." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 29: 135–152.
Golder, Herbert. 1996. "Making a Scene: Gesture, Tableau, and the Tragic Chorus." *Arion* 4: 1–19.
Goldhill, Simon and Robin Osborne, eds. 1994. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge, Eng.
Gombrich, E.H. 1972. *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, (Bollington Series) 25. 5. Princeton.
Gomme, A.W. 1945. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 1. Oxford.
Goodwin, William Watson. 1965. *Syntax of The Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. New York.
Gow, A.S.F. 1912. "On the Meaning of the Word ΘΥΜΕΛΗ." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 32: 213–238.
———1950. *Theocritus*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Eng.
Gow, A.S.F. and D.L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Eng.
Graefe, Rainer. 1979. *Vela Erunt. Die Zeltdächer der römischen Theater und ähnlicher Anlagen*. Mainz am Rhein.
Granger, Frank. 1996–1998 [1931–1934]. *Vitruvius on Architecture*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Gregory, Justina. 1997. *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*. Ann Arbor, MI.
Grene, David and Richmond Lattimore, eds. 1959. *The Complete Greek Tragedies*, 3–4. Chicago.

Griffith, Mark. 1977. *The Authenticity of "Prometheus Bound."* Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1999. *Sophocles Antigone*. Cambridge, Eng.
Gronewald, Michael. 1989. "Konjekturen und Erläuterungen zur Hekabe und zu den Troades des Euripides." *Rheinisches Museum* 132: 221–223.
Gross, Kenneth. 1992. *The Dream of the Moving Statue*. Ithaca, NY, and London.
Grube, G.M.A. 1961 [1941]. *The Drama of Euripides*. New York.
Guthrie, W.K.C. 1971. *Socrates*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1971b. *The Sophists*. Cambridge, Eng.
Hadley, W.S. 1949. *The Hippolytus of Euripides*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1950. *The Hecuba of Euripides*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1953. *Euripides. The Alcestis*. Cambridge, Eng.
Halleran, Michael R. 1985. *Stagecraft in Euripides*. Totowa, NJ.
———. 2000. *Euripides Hippolytus*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
Halliwell, Stephen. 2000. "Plato and Painting." In Rutter and Sparkes: 99–116.
———. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton and Oxford.
———. 2008. *Greek Laughter. A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity*. Cambridge, Eng.
Hamdorf, F.W. 1980. "Zur Weihung des Chairedemos auf der Akropolis von Athen." In *ΣΤΗΛΗ. ΤΟΜΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΜΝΗΜΗΝ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΟΝΤΟΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ*. Nikolaos Kontoleon, ed. Athens: 231–235.
Hamilton, Edith and Huntington Cairns, eds. 1963. *The Collected Dialogues of Plato Including the Letters*, (Bollingen Series) 71. Princeton.
Handley, E.W. 1989. "Comedy." In Easterling and Knox: 103–173.
Harris, Diane. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*. Oxford.
Harrison, Evelyn B. 1996. "The Web of History: A Conservative Reading of the Parthenon Frieze." In Neils 1996: 198–214.
Hartman, Geoffrey H. 1970. *Beyond Formalism. Literary Essays 1958–1970*. New Haven and London.
Hartt, Frederick. 1968. *Michelangelo. The Complete Sculpture*. New York.
Havelock, Eric A. 1968. "Watching the *Trojan Women*." In *Euripides. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Erich Segal, ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 115–127.
Headlam, C.E.S. 1939. *Euripides Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Cambridge, Eng.
Headlam, Walter and A.D. Knox. 1922. *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*. Cambridge, Eng.
Heath, John. 1994. "The Failure of Orpheus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 163–196.
Hedreen, Guy. 2001. *Capturing Troy. The Narrative Functions of Landscape in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Art*. Ann Arbor, MI.
Heinimann, Felix. 1975. "Mass—Gewicht—Zahl." *Museum Helveticum* 32: 183–196.
Henderson, Jeffrey. 2002. *Aristophanes. Frogs, Assemblywomen, Wealth*. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Henrichs, Albert. 1993. "The Tomb of Aias and the Prospect of Hero Cult in Sophokles." *Classical Antiquity* 12: 165–180.
Henle, Jane. 1973. *Greek Myths. A Vase Painter's Notebook*. Bloomington, ID.
Herwerden, Henricus van. 1895. *Εὐριπίδου Ἑλένη*. Leiden.

Heubeck, Alfred and Arie Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 2. Oxford.
Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J.B. Hainsworth. 1990. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, 1. Oxford.
Higgins, Reynold. 1997 [1967]. *Minoan and Mycenaean Art*. New rev. ed. London.
Hodge, A. Trevor. 1960. *The Woodwork of Greek Roofs*. Cambridge, Eng.
Holden, H.A. 1881. *Plutarch's Life of Themistocles*. London.
Holmberg, Erik J. 1979. *Delphi and Olympia*. Gothenburg.
Homolle, Théophile. 1902. "Monuments figurés de Delphes: les frontons du temple d'Apollon (1)." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 36: 587–639.
Hornblower, Simon. 1987. *Thucydides*. Baltimore, MD.
Hourmouziades, Nicolaos C. 1965. *Production and Imagination in Euripides. Form and Function of the Scenic Space*. Athens.
How, W.W. and J. Wells. 1912. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2 vols. Oxford.
Howe, Irving. 1968. *Thomas Hardy*. New York.
Huddilston, John H. 1898. *The Attitude of the Greek Tragedians Toward Art*. London.
Humphreys, S.C. 1980. "Family Tomb and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100: 96–126.
Hurwit, Jeffrey M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1985. *The Art and Culture of Early Greece, 1100–480 B. C.* Ithaca, NY, and London.
Hyman, John. 2006. *The Objective Eye. Color, Form, and Reality in the Theory of Art*. Chicago and London.
Hyslop, A.R.F. 1929. *The Andromache of Euripides*. London.
Iakovidis, Sp. 1969. "Cyclopean Walls." *Athens Annals of Archaeology* 3: 468–472.
Immerwahr, Henry R. 1972. "Athenaikes eikones ston 'Iona' tou Euripide." *Hellenika* 25: 277–297.
———. 1990. *Attic Script. A Survey*. Oxford.
Jameson, Michael. 1990. "Private Space and the Greek City." In *The Greek City From Homer to Alexander*. Oswyn Murray and Simon Price, eds. Oxford: 171–195.
Jannoray, J. 1940–1941. "Nouvelles Inscriptions de Lébadée." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 64–65: 36–59.
Jebb, Richard C. 1890. *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Pt. 4. *The Philoctetes*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1894. *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Pt 6. *The Electra*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1896. *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments*. Pt 7. *The Ajax*. Cambridge, Eng.
Jenkins, Ian. 1994. *The Parthenon Frieze*. Austin, TX.
Jennings, Victoria and Andrea Katsaros, eds. 2007. *The World of Ion of Chios*. Leiden and Boston.
Jeppesen, Kristian. 1958. *Paradeigmata. Three Mid-fourth Century Main Works of Hellenic Architecture Reconsidered*, (Jutland Archeological Society Publications) 4. Aarhus.

Jex-Blake, K., trans., E. Sellers, and Raymond V. Schoder. 1976 [1967]. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Chicago, IL.
Johansen, H. Friis and Edward W. Whittle. 1980. *Aeschylus. The Suppliants*. 3 vols. Copenhagen.
Johnston, Richard W. 1999. "Hermes the Chiseler." *American Journal of Archaeology* 103: 299 (abstract).
Johnston, Sarah Iles. 1999. *Restless Dead. Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Jones, Horace L. 1917–1932. *The Geography of Strabo*. 8 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Jones, Mark Wilson. 2002. "Tripods, Triglyphs, and the Origin of the Doric Frieze." *American Journal of Archaeology* 106: 353–390.
Jones, W.H.S., H.A. Ormerod, and R.E. Wycherley. 1977–1980 [1918–1935]. *Pausanias Description of Greece*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Jope, E.M. 1956. "Vehicles and Harness." In *A History of Technology*, 2. Charles Singer, E.J. Holmyard, A.R. Hall, and Trevor I. Williams, eds. Oxford: 537–562.
Judeich, Walther. 1994 [1931]. *Topographie von Athen*. Chicago.
Kaiser, Norbert. 1990. "Schriftquellen zu Polyklet." In Kreikenbom: 48–78.
Kaltsas, Nikolaos. 2002. "Die Kore und der Kuros aus Myrrhinous." *Antike Plastik* 28: 7–40.
Kamerbeek, J.C. 1967. *The Plays of Sophocles*. Pt. 4: *The Oedipus Tyrannus*. Leiden.
Kannicht, Richard. 1969. *Euripides Helena*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
Karakasi, Katerina, 2003 [2001]. *Archaic Korai*. Los Angeles.
Kardulias, Dianna Rhyan. 2001. "Odysseus in Ino's Veil: Feminine Headdress and the Hero in *Odyssey* 5." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131: 23–51.
Kassel, R. 1983. "Dialoge mit Statuen." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 51: 1–12.
Kern, Otto. 1963 [1922]. *Orphicorum Fragmenta*. Berlin.
Keuls, Eva. C. 1997. *Painter and Poet in Ancient Greece*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Keyser, Jr., William A. 1985. "Steambending. Heat and Moisture Plasticize Wood." In *Fine Woodworking on Bending Wood. 35 Articles Selected by the Editors of Fine Woodworking Magazine*. Newton, CT: 16–21.
Kienast, Burkhart. 1978. *Die Altbabylonischen Briefe und Urkunden aus Kisurra*. Wiesbaden.
Kinkel, Gottfried. 1871. *Euripides und die bildende Kunst*. Berlin.
Kirkpatrick, John and Francis Dunn. 2002. "Heracles, Cercopes, and Paracomedy." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132: 29–61.
Knauer, E.R. 1992. "Mitra and Kerykeion. Some Reflections on Symbolic Attributes in the Art of the Classical Period." *Archäologischer Anzieger*: 373–399.
Korres, Manolis. 1988. "Acropole: Travaux de restauration." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 112: 612.
Koster, W.J.W. 1976. "Le temple d'Apollon à Delphes et l'Ion d'Euripide." In *Festoen Opgedragen aan A.N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta bij haar Zeventigste*

Verjaardag, (Scripta Archaeologica Gronigana) 6. J.S. Boersma et al, eds. Groningen: 373–382.

Kovacs, David. 1983. "Euripides, *Troades* 95–7: Is Sacking Cities Really Foolish?" *Classical Quarterly* 33: 334–338.

——. 1994–2002. *Euripides*. 6 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).

——. 1997. "Gods and Men in Euripides' Trojan Trilogy." *Colby Quarterly* 33: 162–176.

——. 2003. "Toward a Reconstruction of *Iphigenia Aulidensis*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123: 77–103.

Kranz, Walther. 1933. *Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie*. Berlin.

Kreikenbom, D., ed. 1990. *Polyklet. Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik*. Mainz am Rhein.

Kühn, C.G. 1821–1833. *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*. 20 vols. Leipzig.

Kurke, Leslie. 1998. "The Economy of *Kudos*." In Dougherty and Kurke: 131–163.

——. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold. The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton.

Kurtz, Donna C. and John Boardman. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*. Ithaca, NY.

Kurtz, Ewald. 1985. *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise in den Tragödien des Euripides*. Amsterdam.

Kyriakou, Poulheria. 2006. *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte) 80. Berlin and New York.

Lackner, Martin. 1998. "Eine Interpolation in Euripides, Hecuba 467 f.?" *Rheinisches Museum* 141: 230–239.

Lange, K. 2002. *Euripides und Homer. Untersuchungen zur Homernachwirkung in Elektra, Iphigenie in Taurerland, Helena, Orestes und Kyklops*, (Hermes Einzelschriften) 86. Stuttgart.

Langlotz, Ernst, Walter-Herwig Schuchhardt, and Hans Schrader. 1969 [1939]. *Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis*. 2 vols. Frankfurt am Main.

Lapatin, Kenneth D.S. 2001. *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Oxford.

Larson, Jennifer. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults*. Madison, WI.

Latte, Kurt. 1953–1966. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Copenhagen.

Lattimore, Richmond. 1958. *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy*. Baltimore, MD.

Lawrence, A.W. 1996 [1957]. *Greek Architecture*. (5th ed., rev. by R.A. Tomlinson.) New Haven and London.

Lee, K.H. 1997. *Euripides Ion*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.

——. 1997 [1976]. *Euripides Troades*. London.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore, MD.

Lehner, Mark. 1997. *The Complete Pyramids*. London.

Leipen, Neda. 1971. *Athena Parthenos. A Reconstruction*. (Royal Ontario Museum.) Toronto.

Leutsch, Ernestus Ludov. a [*sic*] and F.G. Schneidewin. 1839–1851. *Paroemiographi Graeci*. 2 vols. Gottingen.

Ling, Roger. 1977. "Studius and the Beginnings of Roman Landscape Painting." *Journal of Roman Studies* 67: 1–16.

———. 1991. *Roman Painting*. Cambridge, Eng.

———, ed. 2000. *Making Classical Art. Process & Practice*. Stroud, Gloucestershire, Eng., and Charleston, SC.

Lippman, Mike, David Scahill, and Peter Schultz. 2006. "*Knights* 843–859, the Nike Temple Bastion, and Cleon's Shields from Pylos." *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 551–563.

Lloyd, Michael. 1994. *Euripides Andromache*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. 1994–1996. *Sophocles*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).

Loader, N. Claire. 1998. *Building in Cyclopean Masonry. With Special Reference to the Mycenaean Fortifications on Mainland Greece*. Jonsered, Sweden.

Lobel, Edgar and Denys Page. 1963 [1955]. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. 2nd ed. Oxford.

Loewy, Em. 1976 [1885]. *Inschriften Griechischer Bildhauer. Greek Inscriptions Recording Names and Works of Ancient Sculptors*. Repr. Chicago.

Loraux, Nicole. 1993. *The Children of Athena. Athenian Ideas About Citizenship & the Division Between the Sexes*. Princeton.

Lorentz, Friedrich v. 1937. "ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ ΥΦΑΣΜΑΤΑ." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 52: 165–222.

Lorimer, H.L. 1903. "The Country Cart of Ancient Greece." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 23: 132–151.

———. 1936. "Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology." In *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford: 14–33.

Lowenstam, Steven. 1997. "Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127: 21–76.

MacDowell, Douglas M. 1971. *Aristophanes Wasps*. Oxford.

———. 1982. *Gorgias. Encomium of Helen*. London.

Maier, Friedrich. 1970. *Der ΣΟΦΟΣ-Begriff. Zur Bedeutung, Wertung und Rolle des Begriffes von Homer bis Euripides*. Dissertation: Munich.

Malek, Jaromir. 1999. *Egyptian Art*. London.

March, Jennifer R. 1989. "Euripides' *Bakchai*: A Reconsideration in the Light of Vase-Paintings." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 36: 33–65.

Marchant, E.C. and O.J. Todd. 1979 [1923]. *Xenophon*, 4. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).

Marconi, Clemente. 2007. *Temple Decoration and Cultural Identity in the Archaic Greek World. The Metopes of Selinus*. Cambridge, Eng.

Marcovich, M. 1977. "Euripides *I.T.* 110–115." *Mnemosyne* ser. iv. 30: 288–289.

Marinatos, S. and M. Hirmer. [n. d.] *Crete and Mycenae*. New York.

Mark, Ira S. 1993. *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural Stages and Chronology*, (Hesperia Supplement) 26. Princeton.

Mastronarde, Donald J. 1975. "Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8: 163–176.

———. 1979. *Contact and Discontinuity. Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

———. 1994. *Euripides Phoenissae*. Cambridge. Eng.
———. 2002. *Euripides Medea*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 2010. *The Art of Euripides. Dramatic Technique and Social Context*. Cambridge, Eng., and New York.
Matheson, Susan B. 1995. *Polygnotos and Vase Painting in Classical Athens*. Madison, WI.
Mattusch, Carol. 1988. *Greek Bronze Statuary From the Beginnings through the Fifth Century B. C.* Ithaca, NY, and London.
Mayer, M. 1885. "Der Protesilaus von Euripides." *Hermes* 20: 101–134.
Mayor, Adrienne. 2000. *The First Fossil Hunters. Paleontology in Greek and Roman Times*. Princeton.
McDermott, Emily A. 2000. "Euripides' Second Thoughts." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 130: 239–259.
McGowan, Elizabeth P. 1995. "Tomb Marker and Turning Post: Funerary Columns in the Archaic Period." *American Journal of Archaeology* 99: 615–632.
McLean, B. Hudson. 1996. "The Place of Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos." In *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson, eds. London and New York: 186–225.
Meier, Christian. 1993. *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*. (Trans. Andrew Webber). Baltimore, MD.
Meiggs, Russell. 1982. *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Oxford.
Mercier, Charles E. 1993. "Hekabe's Extended Supplication (*Hec.* 752–888)." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123: 149–160.
Merry, W.W. 1905. *Aristophanes The Frogs*. Oxford.
Michaelis, Adolph. 1871. *Der Parthenon*. Leipzig.
Miller, Margaret C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC. A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1999. "Reexamining Transvestism in Archaic and Classical Athens: The Zewadski Stamonos." *American Journal of Archaeology* 103: 223–253.
Miller, Walter. 1929–1932. *Daedalus and Thespis. The Contributions of the Ancient Dramatic Poets to Our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts of Greece*. 3 vols. (Vol. 1) New York and (vols. 2–3) Columbia, MI, (The University of Missouri Studies) 6, nos. 3–4 and 7, nos. 1–2.
Mondi, Robert. 1983. "The Homeric Cyclopes: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113: 17–38.
Moon, Warren G., ed. 1995. *Polykleitos, The Doryphoros, and Tradition*. Madison, WI.
Morris, Sarah P. 1992. *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton.
Morwood, James. 2007. *Euripides Suppliant Women*. Oxford.
Mossman, Judith. 1995. *Wild Justice. A Study of Euripides' Hecuba*. Oxford.
———, ed. 2003. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Euripides*. Oxford.
Moustaka, Alike. 1993. *Grossplastik aus Ton in Olympia*. Berlin.
Müller, Dietram. 1974. *Handwerk und Sprache. Die sprachlichen Bilder aus dem Bereich des Handwerks in der griechischen Literature bis 400 v. Chr.*, (Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie) 51. Meisenheim am Glan.

Müller, Gerhard. 1975. "Beschreibung von Kunstwerken im Ion des Euripides." *Hermes* 103: 25–44.
Muller-Dufeu, Marion. 2002. *La Sculpture grecque. Sources littéraires et épigraphiques*. Paris.
Murray, A.T. and George E. Dimock. 1995 [1919]. *Homer Odyssey*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Murray, Gilbert. 1905. "The 'Trojan Women' of Euripides." *The Living Age* 245: 37–52.
———. 1913. *Euripidis Fabulae*. 3 vols. Oxford.
———. 1920. *The Thesmophoriazusae of Aristophanes*. London.
Murray, Penelope. 1981. "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101: 87–100.
Naber, S.A. 1864–1865. *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*. Leiden. (Repr. Amsterdam, 1965).
Nagler, Michael N. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition. A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
———. 1996. "Dread Goddess Revisited." In *Reading the Odyssey. Selected Interpretive Essays*. Seth L. Schein, ed. Princeton: 141–161.
Nagy, Blaise. 1981. "A Late Panathenaic Document." *The Ancient World* 3: 107–111.
———. 1984. "The Peplotheke: What Was It?" In *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on His Eightieth Birthday*, (Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monograph) 10. Kent J. Rigsby, ed. Durham, NC: 227–232.
Nagy, Gregory. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore, MD, and London.
———. 1996. *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 2002. *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*, (Hellenic Studies) 1. Cambridge, MA, and London.
Neils, Jenifer, ed. 1992. *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*. Hanover, NH.
———, ed. 1996. *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaia & Parthenon*. Madison, WI.
Nightingale, Andrea W. 1992. "Plato's *Gorgias* and Euripides' *Antiope*: A Study in Generic Transformation." *Classical Antiquity* 11: 121–141.
Norwood, Gilbert. 1954. *Essays on Euripidean Drama*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Oakley, John H. 2004. *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: The Evidence of the White Lekythoi*. Cambridge, Eng.
Oakley, John H. and Rebecca H. Sinos. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. Madison, WI.
Ober, Josiah. 1991. "Hoplites and Obstacles." In *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience*. Victor Davis Hanson, ed. London and New York: 173–196.
Oenbrink, Werner. 1997. *Das Bild im Bilde. Zur Darstellung von Götterstatuen und Kultbildern auf griechischen Vasen*, (Europäische Hochschulschriften Series 38: Archaeology) 64. Frankfurt am Main.
Onians, R.B. 1951. *The Origins of European Thought About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*. Cambridge, Eng.

Önnerfors, A. 1995. *P. Flavii Vegeti Renati Epitoma Rei Militaris*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Oppel, Herbert. 1937. *KANΩN. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (Regula-Norma)*. Leipzig.
Orlandos, Anastasios K. and John. N. Travlos. 1986. Λεξικόν Ἀρχιτεκτονικῶν Ὁρῶν. Athens.
Osborne, Robin. 1987. "The Viewing and Obscuring of the Parthenon Frieze." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107: 98–105.
———. 1994. "Looking on—Greek Style. Does the Sculpted Girl Speak to Women too?" In *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies*. Ian Morris, ed. Cambridge, Eng: 81–96.
Owen, A.S. 1939. *Euripides Ion*. Oxford.
Pack, Roger A. 1963. *Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon Libri V*. Leipzig.
Padel, Ruth. 1990. "Making Space Speak." In Winkler and Zeitlin: 336–365.
———. 1992. *In and Out of the Mind. Greek Images of the Tragic Self*. Princeton.
Padilla, Mark W. 1998. *The Myths of Herakles in Ancient Greece. Survey and Profile*. Lanham, MD.
Page, Denys L. 1934. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
———. 1938. *Euripides Medea*. Oxford.
Palagia, Olga, 1984. "A Niche for Kallimachos' Lamp?" *American Journal of Archaeology* 88: 515–521.
———. 1993. *The Pediments of the Parthenon*. Leiden, New York, and Cologne.
———. 1997. "First among Equals: Athena in the East Pediment of the Parthenon." In Buitron-Oliver: 29–49.
———. 2006. *Greek Sculpture. Function, Materials, and Techniques in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 2006b. "Marble Carving Techniques." In Palagia 2006: 243–279.
Palagia, Olga and J.J. Pollitt, eds. 1996. *Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture*, (Yale Classical Studies) 30. Cambridge, Eng.
Palmer, L.R. 1946. "Mortar and Lathe. Notes on Homer Λ 145–147 and Euripides *Bacchae* 1065–1067." *Eranos* 44: 54–61.
Parisinou, Eva. 2000. *The Light of the Gods. The Role of Light in Archaic and Classical Greek Cult*. London.
Parker, L.P.E. 2007. *Euripides Alcestis*. Oxford.
Parmentier, Léon. 1923. "Notes sur les *Troyennes* d'Euripide." *Revue des Études Grecques* 36: 46–61.
Parmentier, Léon and Henri Grégoire. 1925. *Euripide*, 4. Paris.
Paton, James M., ed. 1927. *The Erechtheum. Measured, Drawn, and Restored by Gorham Phillips Stevens*. (Text by Lacey D. Caskey, Harold N. Fowler, James M. Paton, and Gorham P. Stevens.) Cambridge, MA.
Paton, W.R. 1970–1999 [1916–1918]. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Pauer, Karl. 1935. *Die Bildersprache des Euripides*. Diss: Breslau.
Pavese, Carlo O. 1996. *L'Auriga di Mozia*. Rome.
Pearson, A.C. 1903. *The Helena of Euripides*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1907. *Euripides. The Heraclidae*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1909. *Euripides. The Phoenissae*. Cambridge, Eng.

———. 1917. *The Fragments of Sophocles, Edited with Additional Notes from the Papers of Sir R.C. Jebb and Dr W.G. Headlam*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Eng.
Pedersen, Poul. 1989. *The Parthenon and the Origin of the Corinthian Capital*, (Odense University Classical Studies) 13. Odense.
Peile, Thomas W. 1844. *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. London.
Perdicoyianni, Hélène. 1993. "Le vocabulaire de la douleur dans L'*Hécube* et les *Troyennes* d'Euripide." *Les Études classiques* 61: 195–204.
Petsas, Ph. M. 1961–1962. "Ἀνασκαφὴ ἀρχαίου νεκροταφείου Βεργίνης (1960–1961)." *Archaeologikon Deltion* 17: 218–288.
Philipp, Hanna. 1968. *Tektonon Daidala. Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk in vorplatonischen Schrifttum*. Berlin.
———. 1990. "Zu Polyklets Schrift 'Kanon.'" In Kreikenbom: 135–155.
Pickard-Cambridge, Sir Arthur. 1988 [1968]. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. (2nd ed., rev. by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis.) Oxford.
Picón, Carlos A., et al. 2007. *Art of the Classical World in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New Haven and London.
Plassart, A. 1940. "Eschyle et le fronton est du temple delphique des Alcméonides." In *Mélanges d'études anciennes offerts a Georges Radet*. Fernand Chapouthier, William Seston, Pierre Boyancé, eds. Bordeaux and Paris: 293–299.
Platnauer, M. 1960. *Euripides Iphigenia in Taurus*. Oxford.
Podlecki, A.J. 1975. *The Life of Themistocles*. Montreal and London.
Pollitt, J.J. 1974. *The Ancient View of Greek Art*. New Haven and London.
———. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1990. *The Art of Ancient Greece. Sources and Documents*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1995. "The *Canon* of Polykleitos and Other Canons." In Moon: 19–24.
Poole, Adrian. 1976. "Total Disaster: Euripides' The Trojan Women." *Arion* n. s. 3: 257–287.
Porter, W.H. 1929. *The Rhesus of Euripides*. Cambridge, Eng.
Powell, Anton, ed. 1990. *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*. London and New York.
Powell, Iohannes U. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323–146 A. C.* Oxford.
Preiser, Claudia. 2001. "Achilleus' Heilmittel für Telephos in den *Kyprien*, in Euripides' *Telephos*, bei Plinius und bei Apollodor." *Rheinisches Museum* 144: 277–286.
Prestipino, L. 1989. "L'Erette di Euripide e il Tempio dell'Erechteion." *Zetesis* 9: 11–39.
Primavesi, Oliver. 2007. "Colorful Sculptures in Ancient Literature? The Textual Evidence Revisited." In *Gods in Color. Painted Sculpture of Classical Antiquity*. Vinzenz Brinkmann and Raimund Wünsche, eds. Munich: 193–209.
Pritchett, W. Kendrick. 1956. "The Attic Stelai." *Hesperia* 25: 178–317.
———. 1971–1985. *The Greek State at War*. 5 vols. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
———. 1995. *Thucydides' Pentekontaetia and Other Essays*. Amsterdam.
———. 1998. *Pausanias Periegetes*. Amsterdam.

Pucci, Pietro. 2003 [1977]. "Euripides: The Monument and the Sacrifice." (rev. vers.) In Mossman 2003: 139–169.

Putnam, Michael C.J. 1960–1961. "*Throna* and Sappho 1. 1." *Classical Journal* 56: 79–83.

Rabinowitz, Nancy S. 1993. *Anxiety Veiled. Euripides and the Traffic in Women.* Ithaca, NY, and London.

Race, William H. 1997. *Pindar.* 2 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).

Rackham, H. 1926. *Aristotle. The Nicomachean Ethics.* Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).

——, and W.H.S. Jones. 1938–1963. *Pliny. Natural History.* 10 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).

Raman, Rahim A. 1975. "Homeric ἄωτος and Pindaric ἄωτος. A Semantic Problem." *Glotta* 53: 195–207.

Rau, Peter. 1967. *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes.* Munich.

Raubitschek, A.E. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B. C.* Cambridge, MA.

Rehm, Rush. 1994. *Marriage to Death. The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy.* Princeton.

——. 2002. *The Play of Space. Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy.* Princeton and Oxford.

Renehan, R. 1987. "Review Article: *Curae Callimacheae.*" *Classical Philology* 82: 240–254.

Rhodes, Robin Francis. 1995. *Architecture and Meaning on the Athenian Acropolis.* Cambridge, Eng.

Richter, Gisela M.A. 1927. "ΤΥΠΟΣ and Timotheos." *American Journal of Archaeology* 31: 80–82.

——. 1968. *Korai. Archaic Greek Maidens. A Study of the Development of the Kore Type in Greek Sculpture.* London.

Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. 1981. *Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture.* Princeton.

——. 1992. "Images of Athena on the Akropolis." In Neils 1992: 119–142.

Riedweg, Christoph. 1990. "The 'Atheistic' Fragment from Euripides' *Bellerophontes* (286 N^2)." *Illinois Classical Studies* 15: 39–53.

Rijksbaron, Albert. 1991. *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae.* Amsterdam.

——. 1999. "Lethe for the Lathe? Euripides, *Bacchae* 1066–67 Again." *Mnemosyne* 52: 739–744.

Robert, G. 1897. "Zur Theaterfrage." *Hermes* 32: 421–453.

Roberts, Deborah H. 1987. "Parting Words: Final Lines in Sophocles and Euripides." *Classical Quarterly* 37: 51–64.

Robertson, D.S. 1929. *A Handbook of Greek & Roman Architecture.* Cambridge, Eng.

Robertson, Edward Stanley. 1879. "Notes on the Bacchae of Euripides." *Hermathena* 3: 387–393.

Robertson, Martin. 1975. *A History of Greek Art.* 2 vols. Cambridge, Eng.

———. 1992. *The Art of Vase-Painting in Classical Athens*. Cambridge, Eng.
Robinson, D.M. 1946. *Excavations at Olynthus*, 12: *Domestic and Public Architecture*. Baltimore, MD.
Robinson, D.M. and J.W. Graham. 1938. *Excavations at Olynthus*, 8: *The Hellenic House*. Baltimore, MD.
Rode, Jürgen. 1971. "Das Chorlied." In *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*. Walter Jens, ed. Munich.
Roisman, Joseph. 1997. "Contemporary Allusions in Euripides' *Trojan Women*." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15: 38–47.
Roochnik, David. 1996. *Of Art and Wisdom. Plato's Understanding of Techne*. University Park, PA.
Rood, Tim. 1998. *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation*. Oxford.
Rose, Jesse L. 1942. "The Durative and Aoristic Tenses in Thucydides." *Language* 18, suppl. 1.
Rose, Valentinus. 1886. *Aristotelis qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta*. Stuttgart.
Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. 1982. *The Art of Aeschylus*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Rosivach, Vincent J. 1977. "Earthborns and Olympians: The Parodos of the *Ion*." *Classical Quarterly* 27: 284–294.
Rösler, Wolfgang. 1989. "Typenhäuser bei Aischylos?" In *Demokratie und Architektur. Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie*, (Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Architekturreferat, Wohnen in der klassischen Polis) 2. Wolfgang Schuller, Wolfram Hoepfner, and Ernst Ludwig Schwandner, eds. Munich: 109–112.
Roux, Georges. 1956. "Sur quelques termes d'architecture: 1) ΞΥΛΩΜΑ 2) ΤΑΡΣΟΙ 3) ΤΥΛΩΣΙΣ 4) ΤΥΠΟΙ." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 80: 507–521.
———. 1961. "Le sens de ΤΥΠΟΣ." *Revue des Études anciennes* 63: 5–14.
———. 1976. *Delphes. Son oracle et ses dieux*. Paris.
———. 1992. "La Tholos de Sicyone à Delphes et les origines de l'entablement dorique." In *Delphes: Centenaire de la "Grande Fouille" réalisée par l'École Française d'Athèns (1892–1903)*. J.-F. Bommelaer, ed. Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, Cologne: 151–166.
Rudolph, Conrad. 1990. *The* "Things of Greater Importance." *Bernard of Clairvaux's Apologia and the Medieval Attitude Toward Art*. Philadelphia, PA.
Rutherford, Ian. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
Rutter, N. Keith and Brian A. Sparkes, eds. 2000. *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*. Edinburgh.
Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Chryssoula. 1996. "ΝΑΩΝ ΕΥΣΤΥΛΩΝ. A Fragmentary Inscription of the Classical Period from Vergina." In *Inscriptions of Macedonia* (Third International Symposium on Macedonia, Thessaloniki, 8–12 December 1993). Thessaloniki: 100–122.
Sage, Michael M. 1996. *Warfare in Ancient Greece. A Sourcebook*. London and New York.
Sahin, M. Cetin. 1981. "Aetos: The Greek Pediment." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 44: 146.

Sandys, J.E. 1937. *The Odes of Pindar*. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Sansone, David. 1976. "Miscellanea on Euripides *I.T.* 113–114." *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 29: 79.
———. 1981. *Euripides Iphigenia in Tauris*. Leipzig.
———. 1996. "Socrates' 'Tragic' Definition of Color (Pl. *Meno* 76D–E)." *Classical Philology* 91: 339–345.
Saslow, James M. 1986. *Ganymede in the Renaissance. Homosexuality in Art and Society*. New Haven and London.
———. 1991. *The Poetry of Michelangelo*. New Haven and London.
Schenk, Ralf. 1996. "Zur Bezeichnung 'Korinthisches Kapitell.'" *Archäologischer Anzeiger*: 53–59.
Schefold, Karl. 1992. *Gods and Heroes in Late Archaic Greek Art*. (Trans. A. Griffiths). Cambridge, Eng.
Scheid, John and Jesper Svenbro. 1996. *The Craft of Zeus. Myths of Weaving and Fabric*. (Trans. Carol Volk). Cambridge, MA, and London.
Schmidt, Mauricius. 1965 [1858–1868]. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Amsterdam.
Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
Schurmann, Ulrich. 1982. *The Pazyryk, Its Use and Origin*. Munich.
Schwartz, E. 1887–1891. *Scholia in Euripidem*, 1–2. Berlin.
Scodel, Ruth. 1980. *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, (Hypomnemata) 60. Göttingen.
———. 1996. "Δόμων ἄγαλμα: Virgin Sacrifice and Aesthetic Object." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126: 111–128.
Scranton, Robert L. 1941. *Greek Walls*. Cambridge, MA.
Scullion, Scott. 2002. "Tragic Dates." *Classical Quarterly* 52: 81–101.
———. 2003. "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the *Frogs*." *Classical Quarterly* 53: 389–400.
Scully, Stephen. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca, NY, and London.
Seaford, Richard. 1997. *Euripides Bacchae*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.
Séchan, L. 1926. *Etudes sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris.
Seeberg, Axel. 2002–2003. "Tragedy and Archaeology, Forty Years After." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 46: 43–75.
Segal, Charles P. 1962. "Gorgias and the Psychology of the Logos." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 66: 99–155.
———. 1993. *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow. Art, Gender, and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus, and Hecuba*. Durham and London.
Seidensticker, Bernd. 1978. "Comic Elements in Euripides' *Bacchae*." *American Journal of Philology* 99: 303–320.
Sevinç, Nurten. 1996. "A New Sarcophagus of Polyxena from the Salvage Excavations at Gümüsçay." *Studia Troica* 6: 251–264.
Shapiro, H.A. 1994. *Myth into Art. Poet and Painter in Classical Greece*. London and New York.
———. 1995. "The Cult of Heroines: Kekrops' Daughters." In *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece*. Ellen E. Reeder, ed. Baltimore, MD, and Princeton: 39–48.

———. 2000. "Helen Out of Doors." In *Periplous. Papers on Classical Art and Archaeology Presented to Sir John Boardman*. G.R. Tsetskhladze, A.J.N.W. Prag, and A.M. Snodgrass, eds. London: 271–275.
Shear, Jr., T.L. 1966. *Studies in the Early Projects of the Periklean Building Program*. Diss.: Princeton.
———. 1978. "Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 BC." *Hesperia*, suppl. 17.
Sienkewicz, Thomas J. 1978. "Euripides' *Trojan Women*: An Interpretation." *Helios* 6: 81–95.
Simmonds, D.M. and R.R. Timberlake. 1957. *Euripides. The Cyclops*. Cambridge, Eng.
Simon, Erika, Max and Albert Hirmer. 1981. *Die griechischen Vasen*. Munich.
Simon, Erika. 1997. "An Interpretation of the Nike Temple Parapet." In Buitron-Oliver: 127–143.
Sinclair, T.A. 1932. *Hesiod Works and Days*. London.
Skilton, David, ed. 1978. *Thomas Hardy. Tess of the d'Urbervilles, A Pure Woman*. Middlesex, Eng. and New York.
Smith, R.R.R. 2007. "Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*. S. Hornblower and C. Morgan, eds. Oxford: 83–139.
Smyth, Herbert W. 1963 and 1999. (With an appendix and addendum by Hugh Lloyd-Jones). *Aeschylus, 1–2*. Cambridge, MA, and London. (Loeb Classical Library Edition).
Snell, Bruno and Hartmut Erbse, eds. 1955–. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen.
Snell, Bruno and Herwig Maehler, eds. 1970. *Bacchylidis Carmina Cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig.
———. 1987. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis. Pars I: Epinicia*. Leipzig.
———. 1989. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis. Pars II. Fragmenta. Indices*. Leipzig.
Snodgrass, Anthony M. 1999 [1967]. *Arms and Armor of the Greeks*. Baltimore, MD, and London.
Snyder, Jane M. 1980–1981. "The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets." *Classical Journal* 76: 193–196.
Solmsen, Friedrich. 1963. "Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24: 473–496. Repr. in *Kleine Shriften*, 2 (Hildesheim, 1968), pp. 332–355.
Sommerstein, Alan H. 1996. *Aristophanes Frogs*. Oxford.
Spisak, Art L. 1994. "Martial 6. 61: Callimachean Poetics Revalued." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 291–308.
Sprague, Rosamond K. 1972. *The Older Sophists*. Columbia, SC.
St. Clair, William and Robert Picken. 2004. "The Parthenon in 1687: New Sources." In *The Parthenon and Its Sculptures*. Michael B. Cosmopoulos, ed. Cambridge, Eng.: 166–195.
Stähler, Klaus P. 1972. "Zur Rekonstruktion und Datierung des Gigantomachiegiebels von der Akropolis." In *Antike und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift Hans*

Erich Stier zum 70. Geburtstag. R. Stiehl and G.A. Lehmann, eds. Münster: 88–112.

Stallbaum, Gottfried. 1825–1826. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*. Leipzig.

Stanford, William B. 1967[1947–1948]. *The Odyssey of Homer*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. London and New York.

———. 1971 [1963]. *Aristophanes. The Frogs*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke and London.

Stansbury-O'Donnell, Mark D. 1999. *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art*. Cambridge, Eng.

Starkie, W.J.M. 1968. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. Amsterdam.

Stears, Karen. 2000. "The times they are a'changing: Developments in fifth-century funerary sculpture." In *The Epigraphy of Death. Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*. G.J. Oliver, ed. Liverpool: 25–58.

Steiner, Deborah T. 1994. *The Tyrant's Writ. Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.

———. 2001. *Images in Mind. Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*. Princeton and Oxford.

Stevens, Gorham Phillips. 1936. *The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens*. Cambridge, MA.

Stevens, P.T. 1956. "Euripides and the Athenians." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 76: 87–94.

———. 2001 [1971]. *Euripides Andromache*. Oxford.

Stewart, Andrew F. 1990. *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration*. 2 vols. New Haven and London.

———. 2008. "The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions of 480 B.C.E. and the Beginning of the Classical Style: Part 1, The Stratigraphy, Chronology, and Significance of the Acropolis Deposits." *American Journal of Archaeology* 112: 377–412.

Stieglitz, Robert R. 2006. "Classical Greek Measures and the Builder's Instruments from the Ma'agan Mikhael Shipwreck." *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 195–203.

Stieber, Mary. 1994. "Aeschylus' *Theoroi* and Realism in Greek Art." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 85–119.

———. 1998. "Statuary in Euripides' *Alcestis*." *Arion* 5: 69–97.

———. 1999. "A Note on A. *Ag*. 410–428 and E. *Alc*. 347–56." *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 52: 150–158.

———. 2002. "Measuring True: κανών and στάθμη in Greek Poetry." In *Proceedings of the XIth Congress of the International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies*. Athens: 897–909.

———. 2004. *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*. Austin, TX.

———. 2006. "Further Thoughts on εὔστυλος in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, Vitruvius, and a Late Fifth-Century BC. Inscription from Vergina (*SEG* 46 (1996) 830)." *Philologus* 150: 28–37.

———. 2006b. "The Wheel Simile in *Bacchae*, Another Turn," *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 59: 585–592.

———. 2007. "Euripides, Monumental Painting, and the Portrayal of Space in the Fifth Century BCE." *Word & Image* 23: 45–58.

———. 2009. "Coins and Character in Euripides." In *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*. J.R.C. Cousland and J.R. Hume, eds. Leiden and Boston: 255–272.
Sturt, George. 1993 [1923]. *The Wheelwright's Shop*. Cambridge, Eng.
Summers, David. 1981. *Michelangelo and the Language of Art*. Princeton.
Svenbro, Jesper. 1993. *Phrasikleia. An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. (Trans. Janet Lloyd.) Ithaca, NY, and London.
Tanner, Jeremy. 1999. "Culture, Social Structure and the Status of Visual Artists in Classical Greece." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Sociey* 45: 136–175.
Taplin, Oliver. 2003 [1978]. *Greek Tragedy in Action*. 2nd ed. London and New York.
———. 2007. *Pots & Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B. C.* Los Angeles.
Thompson, Dorothy B. 1944. "The Golden Nikai Reconsidered." *Hesperia* 13: 173–209.
Thompson, Homer and R.E. Wycherley. 1972. *The Athenian Agora*, 14: *The Agora of Athens*. Princeton.
Thompson, Wesley. 1982. "Weaving: A Man's Work." *The Classical World* 75: 217–222.
Thomson de Grummond, Nancy, ed. 1996. *An Encyclopedia of the History of Classical Archaeology*. 2 vols. Westport, CT.
Torrance, Isabelle. 2009. "Euripides' *IT* 72–75 and a *Skene* of Slaughter." *Hermes* 137: 21–27.
Travlos, John. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. London.
Trenkner, Sophie. 1958. *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*. Cambridge, Eng.
Treu, Max. 1971. "Der Euripideische Erechtheus als Zeugnis seiner Zeit." *Chiron* 1: 115–131.
Trell, Bluma L. 1964. "A Numismatic Solution of Two Problems in Euripides." *Numismatic Chronicle* 4: 93–101.
Tuck, Anthony. 2006. "Singing the Rug: Patterned Textiles and the Origins of Indo-European Metrical Poetry." *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 539–550.
Tyrrell, Robert Y. 1901. *The Troades of Euripides*. London.
———. 1951 [1892]. *The Bacchae of Euripides with a Revision of the Text and a Commentary*. London.
Uhlenbrock, Jaimee P. 1986. *Herakles. Passage of the Hero Through 1000 Years of Classical Art*. New Rochelle, NY.
Van der Valk, Marchinus. 1971–1987. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes*. 4 vols. Leiden.
Verdenius, W.J. 1983. "The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism." *Mnemosyne* ser. iv 36: 14–59.
Verrall, A.W. 1890. *The Ion of Euripides*. Cambridge, Eng.
———. 1913. *Euripides the Rationalist*. Cambridge, Eng.
Voigt, Eva-Maria. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta*. Amsterdam.
Vollkommer, Rainer. 1988. *Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece*, (Oxford Monograph) 25. Oxford.

Vollkommer, Rainer, and Doris Vollkommer-Glökler, eds. 2001. *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, 1. Leipzig.

von Steuben, Hans. 1990. "Der Doryphoros (Kat. 41–58)." In Kreikenbom: 185–198.

Wace, A.J.B. 1948. "Weaving or Embroidery?" *American Journal of Archaeology* 52: 51–55.

Wagener, Anthony P. 1931. "Stylistic Qualities of the Apostrophe to Nature as a Dramatic Device." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 62: 78–100.

Walton, J. Michael. 1991. *Greek Theatre Practice*. London.

Walser, Gerold. 2000. "Persische Teppiche als Quelle für die griechische Geschichte?" *Klio* 82: 54–72.

Washburn, Oliver M. 1918. "Iphigenia Taurica 113 as a Document in the History of Architecture." *American Journal of Archaeology* 22: 434–437.

———. 1919. "The Origin of the Triglyph Frieze." *American Journal of Archaeology* 23: 33–49.

Webster, T.B.L. 1939. *Greek Art and Literature 530–400 B. C.* Oxford.

———. 1970. *Sophocles. The Philoctetes*. Cambridge, Eng.

Wecklein, N. 1924. "Die Antiope des Euripides." *Philologus* 79: 51–69.

West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod Theogony*. Oxford.

———. 1978. *Hesiod Works & Days*. Oxford.

———. 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.

———. 1987. *Euripides Orestes*. Warminster, Wiltshire, Eng.

———. 1991–1992 [1971–1972]. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Oxford.

———. 1993. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.

———. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. 1879. "Parerga." *Hermes* 14: 161–186. Repr. in *Kleine Schriften*, 4 (Berlin, 1962), pp. 1–23.

———. 1895. *Euripides Herakles*. 2 vols. Berlin.

———. 1926. *Euripides Ion*. Dublin and Zurich.

Wilkins, John. 1993. *Euripides Heraclidae*. Oxford.

Wilkinson, R.H. 1992. *Reading Egyptian Art*. London.

Willink, C.W. 1986. *Euripides Orestes*. Oxford.

Wilson, John R. 1968. "The Etymology in Euripides, *Troades*, 13–14." *American Journal of Philology* 89: 66–71.

Winkler, John J. and Froma I. Zeitlin, eds. 1990. *Nothing to Do With Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*. Princeton.

Winnington-Ingram, R.P. 1976. "The Delphic Temple in Greek Tragedy." In *Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*. Amsterdam: 483–500.

———. 2003 [1948]. *Euripides and Dionysus. An Interpretation of the Bacchae*. 2nd ed. London.

Woodford, Susan. 1993. *The Trojan War in Ancient Art*. Ithaca, NY.

Woodhead, A.G. 1959. *The Study of Greek Inscriptions*. Cambridge, Eng.

Woodward, Arthur M. 1909–1910. "Some New Fragments of Attic Building-Records." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 16: 187–205.

———. 1940. "Two Attic Treasure-Records." In *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson*, (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, suppl. 1). Cambridge, MA: 377–407.
Wordsworth, Christopher. 1836. *Athens and Attica: Journal of a Residence There*. London.
Wycherley, R.E. 1937. "Aristophanes, *Birds*, 995–1009." *Classical Quarterly* 31: 22–31.
———. 1957. *The Athenian Agora*, 3: *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. Princeton.
———. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton.
Xanthakis-Karamanos, Georgia. 1980. *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*. Athens.
Zanker, Paul. 1995. *The Mask of Socrates. The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. (Trans. Alan Shapiro.) Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford.
Zeitlin, Froma I. 1989. "Mysteries of Identity and Designs of the Self in Euripides' *Ion*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 35: 144–197.
———. 1994. "The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre." In Goldhill and Osborne: 138–196.
———. 1996. *Playing the Other. Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago and London.
———. 2003 [1980]. "The Closet of Masks: Role-Playing and Myth-Making in the *Orestes* of Euripides." (rev. vers.) In Mossman 2003: 309–341.
Zuntz, Günther. 1955. *The Political Plays of Euripides*. Manchester, Eng.

GENERAL INDEX

Acesas, 278*n*, 311
Achaeans, 86, 221, 243, 244, 320
Acharnae, 154
Acheron, 211
Achilles, 26, 37, 105–106, 126, 152, 155, 166, 212–213, 244–247, 318*n*, 321
  shield of, 102, 114, 131, 310, 320, 408
  tomb of, 15, 113, 212, 215–217
Acrocorinth, 134
Acropolis, 14, 17*n*, 25*n*, 28, 71, 96, 103, 111, 136, 138, 139, 142*n*, 144, 158, 184, 186–187, 246, 279, 281, 283, 317, 344*n*, 345
  Archaic, 278, 298
  gallery of the Propylaea in, 210, 216
  korai of, 126–127, 158, 160–161, 176, 278, 323–324
  Nike temple on, 134
  pediments from, 295, 309
  pre-Periclean, 279
Acropolis Museum, 127, 160, 299
acroteria, 29, 293
Adeimantus, 88
Admetus, 22, 163–168, 170, 172, 258, 317, 344, 364, 411–412, 414–415
Adrastos, 203
adyton, 52
Aegeus, 22
Aegina, 37
Aegisthus, 212, 368
Aelius Aristides, 21
Aeneas, 102, 284
Aeschylus, ix, xi–xii, xiv, xv, xxi, xxiii, 3, 8*n*, 52, 55, 65*n*, 74*n*, 90, 116, 131, 166, 232, 253, 257, 276, 343, 408, 418, 430
  Agamemnon, 37, 50, 83, 87–88, 148, 163, 173, 177, 312, 346, 386
  color in, 199
  Libation Bearers, xvii, 237
  painting in, 147, 148
  as parodied by Aristophanes, 313, 334, 341, 426
  Persians, 21, 83, 105
  Prometheus Bound, 13
  Seven Against Thebes, 94
  Supplices, 20
aesthetics, 226
  Archaic, 176
agalma, 25*n*, 120–121, 123–124, 132, 133, 134, 136, 140, 143, 144, 147, 148, 150, 151–153, 155, 156, 169, 171, 172, 182, 185, 260, 376, 401, 419, 423
  of Artemis, 29, 118–119, 345
  of Heracles, 178, 182
Agamedes, 288
Agamemnon, 15, 28, 29, 38, 40, 54, 84, 87, 119, 165, 166, 217–218, 223–224, 288, 312, 316, 329–330, 412
Agatharchos, 198
Agathon, 355
Agave, 73, 74–75, 372
agôn, 423–424
Aithra, 368
Ajax, 15, 19, 20, 128*n*, 244–245, 246*n*, 248, 318*n*, 354
Alcaeus, 21, 94
Alcamenes, 134, 142, 154
Alcestis, 22, 133, 163–164, 166–167, 169–170, 252, 276, 344, 364, 411, 414
Alcibiades, 260, 262
Alcmaeonid temple, 286–287, 289–291, 295, 300
Alexander the Great, 144, 183, 406
Alexandria, 314
Alexandros, 399

Alkinoös, 131, 284
Allan, William, 170, 398
Allen, Thomas W., 289
Alcmaeonids, 373
Altagssprache, xvii
Altai mountains, 312
altars, 27, 31, 51
  of Zeus, 303, 357
  of Zeus Herkeios, 24, 27*n*, 35, 39*n*, 113, 132, 136
Amasis Painter, 317
Amazons, 150, 161*n*, 309, 310
Amphion, 93, 94, 423–425
Amphitryon, 39, 106, 125, 136, 142, 237, 239, 304, 308
amphora, 242
  black-figure "Tyrrhenian" amphorae, 215
  Exekias', 245–248, 318
  Panathenaic, 142
Amymone, 281*n*
anaphora, 137
Anatolia, 93
Anaxagoras, xiii
Anaxagorean physics, 253–254
Andokides Painter, 245*n*
Andromache, 14, 15, 22, 63, 82, 119–121, 125–126, 129–130, 132, 166, 259, 276, 323*n*, 332, 364
  vase paintings of, 122
Andromeda, 146, 167, 391, 400–401, 405–406, 415
Andromeda crater, 146*n*–147*n*
Androsthenes, 287
aniconic pillars, 132
antae, 61, 62, 63, 71, 89
antefixes, 74
Anticleon, 313
Antigone, 59, 120*n*, 122–123, 143, 161, 218, 232–234, 252, 262–263, 265, 266, 276, 378, 379
Antimenes Painter, 250*n*
Antioch, 80
Antiope, 83, 94, 423
aoristic tense, 311, 324
apatê, 223
Aphrodisias, 61*n*
Aphrodite, 205*n*, 251, 258, 277, 322*n*
  hymn to, 142
  statues of, 133, 136
Aphrodite, Fréjus, 142, 145, 154
Aphrodite in the Gardens, 142, 154
Apollo, 1, 36, 86, 95, 97, 102, 108, 120, 121, 171, 193, 268, 278, 279, 297, 312, 322
  images of, 377
  oracle of, 118, 288, 300
  temple of, at Troy, 13–14
  temple of, at Bassai, 44, 145*n*
  temple of, at Delos, 64
  temple of, at Delphi, 25, 41, 52, 57, 62, 65*n*, 91, 92, 205*n*, 219, 280, 284–302, 285, 302, 311, 315, 320, 335, 373
  temple of, at Dreros, Crete, 377
Apollo Agyieus, 291
  agalma of, 133
Apollodorus, 94, 99, 230–231, 341, 410
Apollonios II, 57*n*
Apollonios of Rhodes, 94
araeostyle temples, 45
archaeology, archaeologists, 242, 344, 374, 377
  fifth-century painting and, 204
  on myth in art, 220
  temple of Apollo and, 286, 287, 290–291
  and Trojan horse, 186
Archaic period, 20, 37*n*, 91, 412, 430
  Acropolis in, 278, 298
  aesthetics in, 176
  buildings of, 71, 72, 73, 280
  clothing of, 160
  funerary inscriptions in, 129
  funerary monuments of, 128
  hairstyles of, 160–161
  Heracles depicted in arts of, 180
  korai of, 158, 161, 176
  pediments of, 184, 309, 380
  polychromy in, 176–177
  sculptures of, 290, 404–405, 407–408
  statues from, 126–128, 292

Archaic period (*cont.*)
temples of, 279, 287, 289, 294–295
vases of, 246, 247
weaving in, 327
Archaic smile, 125, 271
Archelaos, xiii, 43, 46, 47
Archilochos, 165, 167, 262
architecture, 1–114, 229, 372, 406
domestic, 30
language of, 7–12, 16, 19, 22–23, 35, 40, 52, 54, 56, 59, 74–75, 78, 89–90, 98, 104, 117, 119, 306–307, 337, 339
stage representations of, 8–9
tent at Delphi and, 303–314
see also building, towers, walls
architraves, 48, 75, 78, 229
Areopagus, 31, 32*n*, 33
Ares, temples of, 154
aretê, 258
Argolid, 91, 93, 96, 101
Argos, Argives, 95, 96, 99, 103, 106, 136, 227, 232, 343, 394
Cyclopean walls of, 12, 16, 91, 100, 104
Ariadne, 131, 408
Aristides, 100, 170, 172
Aristodemos, 422
Aristophanes, xxii, 101*n*, 105*n*, 128–129, 153, 164, 189, 391, 429, 432
Birds, 187, 294, 389–390
Frogs, xvi–xvii, xix–xx, 30, 85, 145, 246–247, 305, 313, 334, 388, 425–426, 430–431
Lysistrata, 331–332
Thesmophoriazusae, 146*n*, 167, 168, 341, 344, 356
Wasps, 294
Women at the Assembly, 242
Aristotle, xvii, 196, 229, 238, 261, 360, 383, 389, 394
on fear and pity, 11
Poetics, 236, 315–316, 431
on spectacle, 255
on staging, xxi
on walls and towers, 80–81, 101
on wisdom, 417
Arnott, Peter, xxi, 9
art, instructional value of, 294
language of gesture in, 202–203
art criticism, 360–400
Artemis, 37, 61, 120, 121, 133, 134, 137, 143
agalma of, 29, 118–119, 345
shrine of, at Brauron, 326
statues of, 133, 135, 137, 142–143, 377, 412
temple of, at Aulis, 32
temple of, at Corfu, 295
temple of, at Ephesos, 73
temple of, in *IT*, 41, 48, 51, 66
temple of, in the Peleponnesus, 119
Artemis Brauronia, 187
artisans, wise, 415–426
artists, as finders, 402–403
habits and thought processes of, 197–198
philosophy and, 195–197
Asclepius, temple of, at Epidauros, 25, 29, 36*n*, 64, 293*n*, 307*n*, 374–375
ashlar masonry, 35, 92, 96, 390–391
Asia, 365
Asia Minor, 105
Astyanax, 4, 6*n*, 9*n*, 15, 63, 81, 82, 113, 119, 267, 377
asyndeton, 63
Atalanta, 53
Athena, 119, 140, 141–142, 144, 156, 161*n*, 212, 219, 237, 246*n*, 247*n*, 253, 254, 283–284, 321, 322, 326, 368, 383, 419–420, 422
aegis of, 309, 320
birth of, 281
Gigantomachy and, 301, 302, 321, 323
headdress of, 309
Heracles and, 30, 38, 125
patron of Athens, 280–281, 283, 324, 334, 336
Peisistratid temple of, 299
statues of, 25*n*, 128*n*, 139, 140–141, 282, 309, 345

Athena (*cont.*),
temple of, at Acharnae, 154
temple of, in Athens, 13–15, 139–140
temple of, in Sparta, 16
temple of, in *Trojan Women*, 113
Trojan war, 28
weaving and crafts and, 102, 277, 311, 334
see also Panathenaia
Athena Areia, temple of, 212
"Athena and Marsyas" (Myron), 370
Athena Nike, temple of, 71, 150–151, 281–284, 298, 299
Athena Parthenos, 140–141, 142, 150, 283
Athena Polias, 139, 140, 282
statue of, 138
temple of, 27, 139, 279*n*, 280
Athena Promachos, 141
Athenaeus, 101*n*, 311
Athenian confederacy, 330
Athens, xvi, 21, 33, 41, 44–46, 49, 86, 87, 95, 111, 112, 124, 132, 135, 156, 181, 183, 210, 217, 255, 266, 298, 300–301, 316, 321–322, 324, 328, 338, 420, 421, 431
Acropolis of, *see* Acropolis
agora at, 31, 33, 156–157, 297, 344*n*
Archon of, 144
arts in, 416
assembly of, 224
Athena's gift to, 281
choregic monument in, 47
Classical houses in, 31–32
foundation myths of, 219–220, 278–281
gravestones in, 202
iconography of, 302, 321
in *Ion*, 277–284
monuments to Heracles in, 125
Periclean, 32, 301
Persian attacks on, 88–89, 127
sculpture in daily life of, 115
self-sufficiency in, 18
temples in, 125, 279
topographical landmarks of, 279
visual arts in, xii, xvi, 124, 218
walls of, 17–18, 95, 342*n*
weaving and, 334–335
Athens NM 2894, 203
Atreus, 296, 319, 333–334
house of, 37, 319, 340
Attic grave reliefs, 122
Attica, 65, 142
Augustan period, 207, 208
Aulis, 32, 243, 244*n*
Austin, Norman, 175–176
autochthony, 95
"Awakening Captive" (Michelangelo), 405–406

"Bacchante" (Scopus), 421
Bacchantes, 157, 347, 371, 421
Bacchic rites, 371
Bacchylides, 99, 100, 181, 276, 409
Barber, E.J.W., 318, 382
Barlow, E.S., 205
Barlow, Shirley A., xv–xvi, 4, 6, 9, 79, 85, 108, 178–179, 185, 200–201, 204, 205, 221, 224, 232–234, 237, 243, 247–249, 251, 287, 332–333, 359, 391
Barrett, W.S., 57–58, 186, 342
Bassai, 44, 145
Bassi, Karen, 170
battlements, 80, 81
beauty, in statuary, 155, 156–157
female, 150, 155–156, 162
female suffering and, 215
Helen's, 162–163, 172–178
male, 149, 153, 156, 162
in painting, 162
in statues, 176, 178
sublimity and, 185
Beethoven, Ludwig van, 204
bell kraters, 272
Bellerophon, 297–298, 301, 395
Berlin Painter, 272
Biehl, Werner, 79, 108, 185, 332
Bildersprache, xiv–xv
Blomfield, C.J., 69

"Bluebeards" pediment, 184–185, 298, 309
Bluemel, Carl, 404
Boardman, John, 245–246
Bond, Godfrey, 105, 136, 178–179, 185, 200, 344, 358–359, 399, 410
Bongers, B.J.J.M., 351
Boston pelike, 254
Boutades, 236
bow drill, 357–358
bows, 347, 354
Braque, Georges, 196
Brauron, 326–327
brick, 54, 289
Brommer, Frank, 181, 183
bronze, 192, 249, 288, 345–346, 347
  hammered, 377
Bronze age, xviii, 16, 61, 91, 96, 103–104
  burial structures of, 15
  chariots in, 350, 354
  doors in, 64
  Egypt in, 351
  houses in, 30–31
  Indus valley in, 353
  landscape in Greek art in, 204
  masonry from, 91–104
  Mesopotamia in, 352
  oral poetry in, 204
  weaving in, 275*n*
bronze statues, 129, 141, 345–347
Brygos Painter, 249, 272
building, 57–58, 104, 342*n*, 383
building inscriptions, 68*n*, 76, 307*n*, 429
buildings, personification of, 292
burials, joint, 165–166
Burkert, Walter, 384, 396
Burnett, Anne, 113, 267
Bury, R.G., 408
Butcher, S.W., 431
Byzantium, 216, 238

Cadmus, 107
Callistratos, 421
Camp, John McK., 80–81
Campbell, A.Y., 176, 351, 353
Capaneus, 33–34, 53, 106, 165, 325, 376
capitals, 48–49
  Corinthian, 46
  gilded, 44*n*
"Captives" (Michelangelo), 406
Caria, 79*n*
Carneades, 402
Carpenter, Thomas H., 215, 255
carpenters, carpentry, 307, 341–342, 383, 414, 415, 421
carpets, 308, 327–328
  Pazyryk, 312–313
caryatids, Erechtheum, 127–128
Cassandra, 5, 14*n*, 15, 84, 113, 128*n*, 155, 165, 166, 329
cava columbaria, 68
Cecrops, 219
ceiling beams, 57, 58
ceilings, 57
  wooden, 54
cella, 72
centaurs, 28
Cephisus river, 142, 251
Cerberus, 178–179
Cercopes, 411*n*
Cézanne, Paul, 230
Chaeredemos, 187
Chalchis, 243–244
Chalcidice, 31
chalk line, 381, 383, 385, 386, 388
character, 255–267, 398
Chardin, Jean Siméon, 199, 231
chariots, 350, 354
Charites, 150, 151
Charon, 211
Chian quarries, 402
chiaroscuro, 230–231
childbirth, 332
  death in, 326
Childe, V. Gordon, 348, 353
chitons, 145, 153, 157*n*, 158, 159, 323
chryselephantine statues, 132, 142, 377

Cicero, 144, 228, 401, 406, 422
Cimon, 212
City Dionysia, 254
Classical period, 18, 20, 54, 59, 71, 91, 95, 161*n*, 193, 197, 198, 240, 307, 314, 404, 421
  architecture of, 30–32, 71, 73
  art of, 154
  clothing of, 158
  entablatures of, 65*n*
  grave reliefs, 202–203
  hairstyles of, 160–161
  Heracles depicted in arts of, 180
  masonry from, 92
  painting in, 208, 210, 213, 214, 216, 226, 274
  peripteral temples in, 71–72
  red-figure vase painting in, 242, 271
  sculpture of, 290, 366, 404, 405, 407–408, 412
  serenity of expression in, 272–273
  statues of, 124, 126, 149–150, 155, 156–157, 176, 412
  temples of, 74, 178
  terracotta groups of, 271
  vases of, 247, 249–250, 256, 271
  weaving in, 327
Cleon, 224
Clymene, 344
Clytemnestra, 37, 276, 326, 329–330, 334, 339, 372
Codrus Painter, 273
Coghill Painter, 253
Collard, Christopher, 34, 35, 136–137, 147, 165, 173, 174, 206, 207, 339, 388, 392, 414
Colonna, Vittoria, 402
colonnades, 31, 48, 65, 71, 72, 89
  peripteral, 66*n*
color:
  local, 199
  orchestral, 199
  in writing, 199, 202
color-modeling, 230–231
colossi, chryselephantine, 132
column drums, 358
columns, 25, 26, 36–48, 49, 61, 78, 133, 188*n*, 229, 291
  centering of, 76
  collapse of, 38
  Corinthian, 36, 41, 44–48
  Doric, 36
  Ionic, 36, 44
  lathing of, 358–359
  porch, 71
  semiotics of, 20
Commodus, 183
concetto, 192
Constable, John, 233
contrapposto pose, 273
coping, 49
Copreus, 369
Corfu, 295
Corinth, 16, 112, 144, 236, 250
Corinthian:
  Capitals, 46
  columns, 36, 41, 44–48
Corinthian treasury, 288*n*
Corinthians, 88
cornices, 48, 49, 51–54
  horizontal, 53, 57
  interior, 42*n*
  raking, 57
Coryphaeus, 363
Craik, Elizabeth, 133
Cratinus, 429
Crelli, Michael, 305
Creon, 157
crepis, crepidoma, 24–25, 26, 30, 49, 289
Crete, 377
Creusa, 26, 81, 218–219, 278, 284, 302, 316–317, 320–323, 325, 327, 332
Croally, N.T., 7
Croesus, 144
Cromey, Robert D., 382, 386
Cropp, Martin, 28, 279, 282, 296, 341–342, 392, 414
cross-dressing, 157–161, 372
crown moldings, 51
crowning, 78
Cruikshank, A.H., 353

cult statues, 132–134, 137, 142, 309
Cyclopean masonry, 12, 16, 24, 28, 63, 90–104, 390
Cyclopes, 17, 29, 91*n*, 93, 95–103, 204
Cyclops, 269–270, 333, 340, 356–358, 363, 369–371, 407
cyma, Lesbian, 389
cyma reversa, 389
Cypress wood, 64, 354

"daidalic", 409, 410–412
Daidalos, 30, 131, 316, 376, 403, 408–412, 414–416, 422
Dale, A.M., 174
Dancing-Maenad reliefs, 154
Dante Alighieri, 192, 210
Darius, 221
David, Jacques-Louis, 231, 233
de Cesare, Monica, 345
Deianeira, 107*n*, 157*n*, 276
Deinocrates, 406
Deiphobus, 14
Delos, 57, 63*n*, 64, 321
Delphi, 75*n*, 112, 143, 144, 210, 213, 283, 288, 291
  Ion's tent at, 35, 302–314
  open air statues at, 346
  panhellenic sanctuary at, 220, 314
  second oracle at, 88
  temple of Apollo at, 25, 41, 52, 57, 62, 65*n*, 91, 92, 205*n*, 219, 280, 284–302, 285, 302, 311, 315, 320, 335, 373
  Treasury of the Athenians at, 71, 181, 183, 297, 301
  visual arts at, 218, 219
Demeter, 318, 324*n*
  shrine of, 368
demiourgoi, 403
democracy, 18
Democritus, 375, 379, 420–421
Demosthenes, 32, 64*n*, 363
Denniston, J.D., 69, 250, 368
dentils, 68
diastyle temples, 45
Diggle, James, 69, 156, 171, 186, 190, 253, 263, 298, 305, 310, 352, 353, 369
Dimitriou, Penelope, 323
Dinsmoor, W.B., 72
Dio Chrysostom, 402
Diodorus Siculus, 103, 197
Diomedes, 183, 212
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 346
Dionysos, 38, 60, 64, 75, 107*n*, 157–162, 247, 255–257, 266, 302, 347, 351, 353, 371–372, 412
  smiling mask of, 255–257
  theater of, 187, 320
Dioscuri, 140, 318
Diotima, 408
dirt, 346–347
"Discobolos" (Myron), 366, 370
Dodds, E.R., 105, 160, 353, 371
Dolon, 399
Domitian, 290
Donahue, A.A., 374
door flaps, 63*n*
door frames, 64
door jambs, 61, 63
door posts, 61, 63*n*
doors, 61, 63, 64
  removal of, 65
Doric:
  buildings, 65, 71
  choregic monument, 122
  columns, 36
  friezes, 65, 67*n*, 68, 73, 74, 301, 345
  temples, 69, 301
  triglyphs, 66
Dörig, José, 291
"Doryphoros" (Polykleitos), 395–396
Dover, Kenneth, 313
dowels, 76
draughts, 244–248
drawing, 175, 242
  preliminary, 241
dreams, 363, 364
Dreros, 377

drills, 357–358
Dunbar, Nan, 389
durative tense, 311, 324
Dürer, Albrecht, 213
Dyson, M., 4

Easterling, P.E., 7, 90
eaves, 52
Egypt, 169, 170, 172, 196, 235–236, 404
  Bronze age, 351
eidôlon, 124
  of Helen, 169–172, 175, 192, 339
ekphrasis, 178, 180, 200, 204, 205, 214, 219, 243, 244, 251
  on temple of Apollo in *Ion*, 284–302
  on tent in *Ion*, 302–314, 315, 316, 319–320, 324
Eleans, 72
Electra, xvii, 55, 166, 250, 317, 333–334, 339, 340, 345, 347, 367, 372
Eleusis, 25, 35*n*, 36*n*, 53*n*, 61*n*, 65*n*, 74, 76, 129, 294*n*, 358, 368
  portico at, 306, 307*n*, 342*n*
  rites at, 212
Elgin Marbles, 293
Elpenor, 254
Elpinicê, 212
Elysium, 102
embossing, 379
embroidery, 277, 308
empolia, 76, 78
enargeia, 284
Endoios, 139
entablature, 49, 51, 65, 89
Eos, 253
epic, 7
  cycles, 247
  devices, 201
Epicharmus, 284*n*
Epidauros, 25, 29, 35*n*, 36*n*, 63*n*, 64, 294, 306*n*
Epigenes, 164
epigraphy, xxi
Erechtheid protohistory, 219
Erechtheids, House of the, 320
Erechtheum, 25, 28, 35*n*, 46, 61, 67*n*, 138, 139, 279*n*, 280, 293, 294*n*
  caryatids, 127
Erechtheus, 138, 278, 281
Erichthonios, 219–220, 309, 320
Erinyes, 344, 398
Eros, 107–108
erôs, 163
eroticism, 165, 166, 168
  and beauty in sculpture, 162
  female nudity and, 147–148, 151
  in paintings, 222–223
êthos, 213, 261
Etna, 17
Etruscan:
  market, 215
  sarcophagi, 164
Euangelos of Koile, 187
Euclides, 43
Eumelos, 409
Euripides, 364
  Alexandros, 399
  allusions to art in, xi–xii
  archaeology and, xi*n*, 90–91, 134–135
  architectural language of, 7–12, 16, 19, 22–23, 35, 40, 52, 54, 56, 59, 74–75, 78, 89–90, 98, 104, 117, 119, 306–307, 337, 339
  artisanal language of, xiv–xvi, xviii–xxi, 10, 12, 23, 29, 104, 174, 239, 306–307, 310, 337–338, 340–360, 373, 379, 380, 387, 388, 396–397, 414, 419, 426–427, 429–430, 432–433
  on the artist and the creative act, 337
  at Archelaos' court, 43, 46–47
  on beauty, 396
  as character in Aristophanes, 146, 305, 313, 334, 341, 356, 388, 425–426
  choral passages of, 201–202, 243–244, 249, 251
  color in, 199–200, 202

as craftsman, 100
cynicism of, 156
door imagery in, 65
dramaturgical uses of statues in, 117–118
etymologies in, 185–186
on the gods, 110
as humane playwright, 427
and instructional value of art, 294
as intellectual, 197, 429
irony of, 29–30
Kallimachos and, 47–48
landscape imagery in, 204–207
language of art criticism in, 360–400, 430
language of gesture in, 203
language of sculpture and statues in, 115–116, 118, 129–130, 145, 147, 155, 223, 337
language of weaving in, 275–277, 315, 331, 334, 337
later choral odes of, 200
lyric and epic language used by, 202, 409
messenger speeches of, 200–202
as painter, xii–xiv, 200
painterly language in, 179–180, 223, 274, 337
popularity of, ix
prose writers and, 429–430
realism of, xvii, xviii, 8*n*, 11, 28, 202, 229, 243, 311, 359*n*, 431–433
reality vs. appearances in, 227
sophos word group in works of, 418
staging of, xxii, 8–9
technical language of, 22, 55, 61, 67, 78, 89–90, 174, 337
temple of Apollo as depicted by, 290–291
visual arts and, ix, 195, 197, 198, 408–409
walling of Thebes and, 93–94
women portrayed by, 275–276
Euripides the younger, 47
Europa, 94
Eurylochus, 211
Eurynome, 151
Eurystheus, 96
eustyle temples, 45, 47
euthynteria, 26
Eutychides, 80
Evadne, 106, 165, 325–326
Exekias, 245–248, 318

Fama, 412
felloes, 350, 354, 355, 356
Fick, Gordon, 282
Florence, 193
Foley, Helene, 255
Ford, Andrew, 320
foundations, 24–35, 49, 89
Foundry Painter, 249, 256
François Vase, 318, 324*n*
Frazer, J.G., 92, 94, 122, 281, 287
"free" painting, *see* monumental painting
Fréjus Aphrodite, 142, 145, 154
friezes, 51, 74–75, 89, 277, 283, 285
animal, 313
chariot, 318, 323–324
Doric, 65, 67*n*, 68, 73, 74, 301, 345
Ionic, 299, 300–301
Parthenon, 59, 128, 139, 244, 250, 271, 299, 301
in peplos, 318
Telephos, 357
triglyph, 51, 66*n*, 69, 73
Fuchs, Werner, 47, 48
funerary epitaphs, 128
iconography, 203
inscriptions, 42–43
inscriptions, Archaic, 129
monuments, Archaic, 128
statues, life-size, 164
vases, white-ground, 202
Furies, 140

Galen, 36, 294*n*, 394–395
game playing, 244–248
Ganymede, 107–108, 267–273
geisa, 69
Geometric vases, 199

gesture, language of, 202–203
Gigantomachy, 177, 218, 263, 283, 295, 297, 299–302, 309, 318, 319, 321, 324, 328, 336
gilding, 377, 379
Glaukê, 158–159, 161, 252*n*
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 206
gold, 192, 377
  beaten, 339–340
  hammered, 377
  inlay of, 376
Golder, Herbert, 122, 413
Gombrich, E.H., 231
Gorgias of Leontini, 18*n*, 144, 163, 375
grave reliefs:
  Attic, 122
  Classical Athenian, 202–203
gravestones, 303
Greece, Greeks, 18, 51, 84, 85, 93, 104, 109–110, 170, 172, 176, 185, 215–217, 221, 267, 308, 313, 330, 409
  army of, 248, 249
  Classical, *see* Classical period
  Hellenistic, *see* Hellenistic period
  illusionistic space in art of, 198–199
  painting in, 198
  rationality of, 196
  urban topography in, 15–16
Gregory, Justina, 141, 224
Gruben, Gottfried, 289
Gyges, 288*n*

Hadley, W.S., 134
Hagêsidamus, 269
Halleran, Michael, 58, 239–240, 338, 342
Halliwell, Stephen, 257*n*
Hammurabi, code of, 385
Handley, E.W., 429
hapax legomena, 48*n*, 143, 190, 241, 332, 339, 429
Hardy, Thomas, 2–3, 112
Harmony, 251
hearths, 24*n*, 31*n*, 91*n*
Hecate, 134, 155
Hector, 14–15, 17, 37, 63, 82, 93, 113, 194, 259, 323*n*, 331, 332–333, 377, 378, 411*n*
Hecuba, 4, 5, 14, 15, 49, 78–79, 81–89, 109, 111, 113–114, 124–125, 155, 165, 221–226, 231–232, 233, 262, 268, 276, 316, 330, 332, 338, 377, 399–400, 412, 413
Hekatompedon, 280
Helen, xviii, 14–15, 28, 53, 63, 82–84, 85, 113, 155, 162–163, 166, 169, 172–178, 176, 178, 221, 267–268, 270, 275, 326, 329, 334, 338–339, 344, 372, 399
  eidôlon of, 169–172, 175, 192, 339
  palinodic version of myth of, 169, 177
Heliades, 205*n*
Helicon, 278*n*, 311
Heliodorus, 75*n*
Helios, 253
Hellanicus, 99, 100
Hellenistic period, 80, 124, 151, 270, 307, 314, 383, 404, 406, 416
  doctrines of, 421
  Greek art before, 204–205
  sculpture in, 162
Hellespont, 221
hendiadys, 63, 77*n*, 138, 234, 362, 378
Hephaisteion, 25*n*, 154, 181, 183, 297
Hephaistos, 25*n*, 101, 102, 131, 143, 340, 408, 420, 422
Hephaistos Painter, 247*n*
Hera, 30, 168, 171, 216
  temples of, 72, 221, 238
Hera of Samos, 160
Heracles, 26, 28, 30–32, 35, 38–39, 50, 63, 87, 96–97, 98*n*, 106, 136, 153, 157*n*, 200, 237, 239, 240, 258, 263, 304, 310, 312, 315, 358, 359, 363, 390, 398, 409–411, 413
  labors of, 178–185, 297–298, 300, 301, 309
  temple of, 125

Heraion, 72, 221
Hermes, 13, 26, 93–94, 278, 413, 424
Hermione, 53, 119–120, 126, 128, 129–130, 132, 171
Hermogenes, 45, 47
herms, 31*n*, 60*n*, 291
Herodotus, 65, 83, 88, 144, 157, 170, 221, 224, 240, 288*n*, 289, 308, 313, 349, 373, 419, 429
Hesiod, 349, 350
  Theogony, 99, 101, 102, 151, 181
Hestia, 24
  statues of, 133
Hesychius, 60, 67, 68*n*, 77*n*, 303
Hippodamia, 305, 387
Hippodamian model, 48n
Hippolytus, 132–133, 136, 142, 155–156, 222–223, 233, 258, 262, 317, 338, 342
Hippomedon, 218, 262–263
Hodge, A. Trevor, 342
Holloway, R.R., 128
Homer, xiv, xvii, xviii, xix, 7, 16, 17, 41, 63, 79*n*, 98, 112, 116, 170, 205, 246, 261–262, 265, 333, 342, 343, 391, 416, 422, 423, 430
  architectural metaphors in, 19–20
  ekphrasis on the shield of Achilles by, 310, 320
  fictive landscape in, 214
  Iliad, 3, 7, 16*n*, 19, 60, 86, 93, 114, 131, 143, 151, 162, 166, 232, 268, 275, 277, 289, 310, 320, 323*n*, 350, 355–356, 378, 382, 396, 408, 419
  Odyssey, 19, 36, 40, 50, 60, 80*n*, 94, 100, 102–103, 105, 131, 151, 155, 191, 204, 213, 253, 275, 277, 283, 284, 354, 357–358, 396
Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, 268–269
Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 288
Homeric Hymns, 151, 253
homoeroticism, 148*n*, 155
Homolle, Théophile, 290
Horace, 230, 248
Horai, 151
Hourmouziades, Nicolaos C., 285, 291
House of the Labyrinth, 238
House of the Small Fountain, 238
House of the Tragic Poet, 217
Huddilston, John H., xi
Hurwit, Jeffrey, 93
hydria, 250, 253
Hyettus, 125
hypallage, 190, 343, 388

Iasos, 61*n*, 79*n*
iconography, 198, 202, 215
  of architectural sculptures, 294
  of Athens, 302, 321
  funerary, 203
Iktinos, 44, 229
"Ilioupersis" (Polygnotus), 210–212, 217
Ilioupersis tradition, 27*n*
impression, 234*n*, 374
indented trace, 81
India, 352
Indus valley, 353
intersectio, 68
Iolaus, 62*n*, 315
Ion, 26, 51, 81, 218–223, 221, 226, 227, 231–232, 233, 262, 265, 278, 279, 280, 284, 302, 308, 310–311, 314, 317, 319, 320, 323, 335, 363
Ion of Chios, xiii
Ionic:
  columns, 36, 44
  friezes, 299, 300–301
  temples, 71, 73, 281
Iphigenia, 29, 37–38, 40–41, 42*n*, 48, 50, 60, 119, 148, 153, 174, 217–218, 296, 317, 318–319, 326, 334, 345
Iphis, 325–326
Iris, 39
Israel, 381
Italy, Renaissance, 193
Iunmutef, 37*n*

Jannoray, J., 53–54
Jason, 106, 240, 252*n*, 317, 343
Jebb, Richard C., 282
Jericho, 95
Jesus of Nazareth, 415
Johnston, Sarah Iles, 326–327
joinery, 341–343, 414
Jones, Mark Wilson, 70
Julius II, Pope, 405

Kalamis, 282
Kallikrates, 229
Kallimachos, 43–48, 101, 154
Kannicht, Richard, 170, 173, 175, 392
kantharos, 256, 272
Keats, John, 114*n*, 243–244, 293, 311, 324–325, 432
Kekropidai, 220
Kekrops, 309–310
Keuls, Eva C., 230, 242
Kinkel, Gottfried, xi
Kisurra, 385
Kleophrades Painter, 128*n*
Knidian Aphrodite, 146
Knossos, 131
  dancing floor at, 408
  Linear B tablets at, 348
korai, 126, 128, 159, 322
  Acropolis, 126–127, 158, 160–161, 176, 278, 323–324
  Archaic, 158, 161, 176
Kore (Persephone), 134, 143
kosmêsis, 178
kouroi, 128, 160
Kovacs, David, 109, 186, 310, 339, 353
Kranz, Walther, 200
kraters, 250*n*, 269
  bell, 272
Kultbild, 153*n*
Kurke, Leslie, 156
Kurtz, Ewald, 85, 148–149, 156–157, 175, 190, 239, 425
kylix, 269
Kyriakou, Poulheria, 49, 152–153, 338

Lacedemonians, 72
Laconian Dancers of Kallimachos, 46, 154
Laertes, 277
Laestrygonians, 100*n*, 204
landscapes, 204–214
  in Euripides, 204–207
  fictional, 204, 214
Laodamia, 170
Laodicê, 211
Laomedon, 390
lares compitales, 60*n*
Late Geometric period, 93
lathes, 352–353, 358–359
  gear-driven, 351
Lattimore, Richmond, 251
Lawrence, A.W., 54
lead-pourers, 129
Lebadeia, 54, 288, 307*n*, 342*n*
Leda, 318
Lee, K.H., 4, 9, 32, 79, 82, 85, 108, 134, 185, 190, 278, 280, 282, 285*n*, 287, 292, 298, 299, 332
lekythos, 317
Leonardo da Vinci, 231
Leonidas of Tarentum, 45*n*, 383
Leontichus, 383
Lerna, 281*n*
Lesche of the Knidians, 210
Leto, 36, 193, 292, 377
Lid Painter, 253
Life of Euripides (*Vita*), xii–xiii
Linear B tablets, 348
linear perspective, true, 198
lintels, 75
literature, imagery in, 203–204
  paintings described in, 205–211
  "the painterly" in, 203–204
Lloyd, Michael, 364
Loader, N. Claire, 93
local color, 199
"Longinus", xvii
Louvre Museum, 160, 214
Lucian, 230
Ludius, 207
Lycia, 154, 205–206
  city-reliefs of, 206–207

Lycus, 39*n*, 106, 303–304
Lydia, 65
Lykaon Painter, 214
Lyric poetry, 200
Lysippos of Sikyon, 80, 227–228, 396
Lysistrata, 331–332
Lyssa, 39, 50

MacDowell, Douglas M., 313
Macedonia, 43, 47
maeander, 323
maenads, 47, 154, 155
Maier, Friedrich, 418
Maiistas, 57, 64*n*
Makron, 318, 324*n*
Mandrocles the Samian, 221
Mannerism, 246*n*, 247*n*
maquettes, 374
Marathon, 138, 140, 213, 329, 430
marble, 289, 292, 302, 402, 406
Marchant, E.C., 263
Marconi, Clemente, 295
Marcovich, M., 69
Mardonius, 313
masonry, 57, 341, 392
Mastronarde, Donald, 34, 77, 133, 143, 234, 239–240, 263, 363–364
Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, 375
measuring cord, 381–382, 385
measuring instruments, 381–390, 393
Medea, 22, 106, 158, 203, 240, 241, 258, 276, 332, 343, 416
media, time-based, 366
Medici Chapel, Florence, 193
Medusa, 211
Megara, xii, 24, 39*n*, 105, 182, 332, 398
Meidias, 64*n*
Meidias Painter, 251
Meiggs, Russell, 64–65
Melanippides, 422
Melos, massacre at, 11*n*
Memphis, 170
Menelaus, 16, 51, 52, 53, 55, 83, 85, 106, 163, 166, 169, 171–172, 177, 211, 217, 221, 284, 339, 344
Mercier, Charles E., 223
Merops, 133, 344
Mesopotamia, 351, 353
metalwork, metalworkers, 340–341, 400
metaphors, 7, 19–20, 22, 243, 340
  architectural language and, 23, 49, 52
  mixing or stacking of, 58
Meton, 390
metonymy, 49
metopes, 51, 65, 67–68, 69, 70, 71, 73–74, 183, 285, 287, 297–299, 301, 375
Metropolitan Museum of Art, 207, 317
Michelangelo Buonarroti, 192–193, 210, 231, 266, 402–406, 413
Midas, 288n
Mikon, 213
Miletus, 65, 224
Miller, Margaret C., 329
Miller, Stephen G., 296
Miller, Walter, x–xi, 173, 217–218, 285–286, 319
mimesis, 267, 292, 401, 418, 425
  in painting, 195, 199, 203, 226, 274
  in theater, 274
  in visual arts, 226, 229
Mimnermos, 253
Minos, 271*n*, 414, 422
mitrai, 161*n*
Mnesicles, 307
modeling, 235, 236, 401
  color-, 230–231
models, 372–373, 374, 375, 376, 404
molds, 375, 376, 379
Monet, Claude, 231
Mongolia, 312
monumental painting, 197–198, 232, 235, 241, 242–243, 273–274
  eroticism in, 222–223
  loss of Greek, 205, 208–214
  of Polyxena, 216–217
Morelli, Giovanni, 118*n*

Morellian method, 118, 249, 432
Morris, Sarah P., 220, 409, 410
Mossman, Judith, 147, 224, 412
Mount Athos, 406
Mount Etna, 97–98, 101
Mount Helicon, 278*n*, 304
Mount Ida, 330
Mount Olympos, 32, 267
Mount Parnassus, 81, 304, 332
movement, 365–366, 369
Müller, Dietram, xi, 286
Mummius, 236
Muses, 420–421
music, 423–424
Muybridge, Eadweard, 366
Mycenae, 16, 28, 33, 91
  acropolis of, 14–15
  Lions Gate at, 37*n*, 61, 92, 99, 103
  masonry at, 92
  walls of, 81, 95, 96, 99, 100, 390
Myrmidons, 155
Myron, 366, 370
Myrtilos, 77
Mytilene, Mytileneans, 64*n*, 224

Nagler, Michael, 20
Naples, 217, 253
nature, representation of, 204, 208
Nauplia, 100
Nauplius, 212
Nausicaa, 19, 80*n*, 155, 213
Near East, 196, 377, 385
  languages of, 384
Necessity, 133–134
"Nekyia" (Polygnotus), 210–212
Nemea, 294, 294*n*, 296, 379, 410
Neoplatonists, 403
Neoptolemus, 15, 25, 61–63, 119–120, 128, 215, 259
Nereid Monument, 145, 154, 155*n*
Nereids, 145, 152, 153, 154, 155
Nereus, 152, 153
Nero, 290
Nicias, 21
"Night" (Michelangelo), 193
"Night" (Strozzi), 193
Nike, Nikai, 144, 155, 281–284
  of Paionios, 145, 154*n*
  temple parapet figures, 154
  see also Temple of Athena Nike
Nikodamos of Mainalos, 282
Niobe, 120–122, 125, 129–130, 193–194
Niobid Crater, 254
Niobid Painter, 122, 214
Niobids, 121–123, 145, 149–150, 214
nous, 192, 422
nudity, of female statues, 145–151, 158
  of male statues, 153, 156
numen, 131*n*
Nymphs, 153
  temple of the, 236

Ocean, 151
Ocnus, 212
"Ode on a Grecian Urn" (Keats), 243–244, 311, 324–325
odes, Pindaric, 178
Odysseus, 15, 17, 19, 29, 38*n*, 49, 97, 98, 155, 208, 209, 211–213, 214, 253, 254, 283, 284, 306, 354, 356–358, 407, 416
Oedipus, 20, 21, 57, 124–125, 168, 346
oikos, 65, 136, 156
oinochoe, Attic red-figure, 370
Oinomaos, 77
Olen, 419
Oltos, 272
Olympia, 59, 72, 122, 144, 154*n*, 179, 181, 184, 282, 297, 404
Olympia Museum, 413
Olympus, 139, 269, 398
Olynthos, 31, 32*n*
"On Seeing the Elgin Marbles" (Keats), 244, 293
On the Sublime, 421
Onesimos, 27*n*
opae, 68, 70
Oppel, Herbert, 384
Opper, Thorsten, 47, 48

Orestes, xvii, 33*n*, 38, 40, 41, 51, 52, 54–55, 66, 69, 71, 72, 128, 140, 151, 153, 154, 166, 171, 212, 296, 317, 318–319, 326, 338, 345
Orphic Theogonies, 102
orthostate, 35, 289
outline, 236–237, 238
Owen, A.S., 220, 280, 282, 283, 286, 305, 323

Padel, Ruth, 39
Padilla, Mark W., 180–181
Page, Denys, 251
painting, 196–274, 372, 422
  abstract, 198, 225
  Aeschylus and, 147, 148
  agalmata and, 172–176
  apatê of, 223
  beauty in, 162
  contour lines in, 235–237
  depth in, 198
  distance and perspective in, 225–232
  form in, 235
  genre details in, 209–210, 213, 214
  historical, 210
  Iphigenia in, 217–218
  illusionism in, 115, 198, 231, 237, 274
  as instructors, 218–232
  landscapes in, 204–214
  language of gesture in, 202–203
  loss of Greek monumental, 205, 208–214
  mimesis in, 195, 199, 203, 226, 274
  monumental, 205–211, 232, 235
  monumental vs. vase, 197–198
  mural, 213
  mythological, 210
  origins of, 235–236, 401
  planarity in, 198–199
  Polyxena in, 215–217
  realism in, 228
  representational, 204, 225
  Second Style Pompeiian, 208
  shadow, 230
  spatial depth in, 196, 199
  three-dimensionality in, 231, 234–235, 237, 274
  trompe-l'oeil illusionism in, 209–210
  two-dimensionality in, 237
  vase, ix, 179, 183, 205, 213
  see also monumental painting; vase painting
Palamedes, 244, 248, 344
Paley, F.A., 56, 58, 77, 79, 106, 137, 148, 174, 221, 237, 280, 303, 304–305, 353, 358–359, 368, 373, 388, 392, 394, 410
Palladium, theft of, 345*n*
Pallas, 302
Palmer, L.R., 353
Pan, 401
Panainos, 213
Panathenaia, Panathenaic, 138, 140, 156, 277*n*, 335
  amphorae, 142
  peplos, 277, 278*n*, 301, 308*n*, 315, 318, 319, 321–325, 328, 335–336, 409
  procession, 301
  shipcart, 328, 344*n*
  way, 344*n*
paragone, 315, 425
parapet, 54
paregmenon, 165
parerga, 309
Paris, 14, 22, 170, 171, 172, 270, 347*n*, 398, 399
Parker, L.P.E., 166, 364
parodos, 41, 243, 323
parodos, ekphrasis on temple of Apollo in *Ion*, 284–302
Paros, 401
Parrhasios, 209, 217, 233, 235, 237, 261, 263–265, 341
Parthenon, 44–45, 49, 71, 127*n*, 229, 254, 279, 281
  building accounts of, 293

Parthenon (*cont.*),
frieze of, 59, 128, 139, 244, 250, 271, 299, 301
lion heads on, 74, 75
metopes of, 301
pediments of, 281, 283, 293, 295
roof of, 342*n*
transparent drapery of statues in pediments of, 154
Parthenopaeus, 53
Parthenos, 144
shield of the, 301
Pasiphaë, 410, 414
pathos, 11, 147
patina, 345–347
Patroclus, 120*n*, 166
patterns, 366, 370, 372
Pauer, Karl, 257
Pausanias, xi*n*, 33, 46, 72, 83, 91, 92, 94, 99–100, 103, 119, 121*n*, 122, 125, 132, 133–134, 138, 139, 142, 144, 151, 186–189, 191, 197, 210–213, 216–217, 226*n*, 281–283, 286, 287–291, 309, 408, 419
Pearson, A.C., 378, 386, 387
Pedagogue, 232–234
pedimental sculptures, 290
pediments, 49, 56, 89, 254, 277, 281, 285, 291–301, 404
Acropolis, 295, 309
Archaic, 184, 309, 380
"Bluebeards", 184–185, 298, 309
"floating" Archaic limestone, 184
Gigantomachy, 309
Parthenon, 281, 283, 293, 295
tympanum of, 73
Peisandrus of Cameirus, *Herakleia* of, 181
Peisetairos, 390
Peisistratids, 288*n*
Pelasgians, 95
Peleid line, 132
Peleus, 269, 318
Peloponnese, Peloponnesians, 60, 179
Peloponnesian war, 5, 11*n*, 17, 18, 96, 104, 431
Pelops, 77, 385, 387
Penelope, 19, 253, 275, 277, 318
Penelope Painter, 318, 382, 386
Penthesileia Painter, 272
Pentheus, 38, 60, 64, 73, 75, 157–161, 159, 255, 317, 347, 356, 371–372
peplos, 158, 159*n*, 217, 309, 317–318, 326
Athens as city of the, 277–278
Panathenaic, 277, 278*n*, 301, 308*n*, 315, 318, 319, 321–325, 328, 335–336, 409
Perachora, 70
Pergamon, 357
Pergamus, 217
Periclean Athens, 32, 301
Periclean Parthenon, 279
Periclean Propylaia, 127
Pericles, 18, 32, 96, 302, 327
building program of, 307
funeral oration of, 5, 19
Periclymenus, 53
Perimedes, 211
periphrasis, 292, 322, 324, 338, 344, 364, 414
peripteral temples, 71–73, 301
peristyle, 40–41
Persephone (Kore), 134, 143
Perseus, 99*n*, 146, 166, 400–401, 406, 415
Persian empire, Persians, 88, 176, 246*n*, 327–328, 330, 335
tents of, 308
Persian wars, 17, 18, 88–89, 127, 278, 284, 308, 313
technical advances in the arts after, 195
personification, 4–5
of building parts, 292
perspective, distance and, 225
linear, 198
petrification, 66*n*, 72, 125, 130
Phaedra, 57, 58, 59, 276, 332, 343, 377
Phaethon, 205–207, 209
Phaleron, 18

Pheidian age, xii
Pheidias, 122, 140, 141, 145*n*, 213, 254, 307, 309, 417, 422
Philip of Thessalonika, 383
Philipp, Hanna, xx, 242
Philomela, 315–316
philosophy, visual arts and, 195–197
Philostratos, 200, 256
Philoxenus, 143
Phoebus, 143, 144, 390
Phoenicia, 419
Photius, 238
Phrasikleia, funerary epitaph of, 128
phrenes, 259*n*
Phrygian slave, xviii, 65, 171, 269, 326, 329, 334
Phrygians, 187, 398
  weaving of, 329–331
Phrynichus, 224
Phthia, 321
Phthian temples, 16, 62
Picasso, Pablo, 196
Picken, Robert, 49
pilasters, 61, 63
pillars, 36, 133
  aniconic, 132
Pinakothêkê, 212
Pindar, 36–37, 41, 42, 63, 95, 98–99, 102, 116, 151, 183, 200, 269, 287–288, 293, 384, 396, 418–419, 420
  Nemean odes of, 30, 115, 181, 242
  Olympian odes of, 112, 181
  Pythian odes of, 39, 112
pins, 77, 78
Piraeus, 17, 18, 95, 342*n*
Pistias, 367
pithos, 191*n*
plaiting, 278*n*
Plataea, 212, 313
  battle of, 111, 308, 329
  Oath of, 127
Platnauer, M., 29–30, 68, 70, 152
Plato, xvi–xvii, 261, 356, 360, 415
  Charmides, 387–388
  Cratylus, 422
  Gorgias, 424
  Ion, 221, 265, 403, 420, 426
  Meno, 199
  on painting, 115, 196, 230, 232, 274
  Phaedrus, 169
  Philebus, 383
  Protagoras, 422
  Republic, 174–175, 176, 238–239, 274, 294, 418, 421, 425
  Sophist, 229
  Symposium, 260, 403, 408, 420
Platonic forms, 261*n*
Pliny, 43, 46, 101, 144, 197, 207, 209, 210, 217, 227, 228, 229, 235–236, 242, 366, 394, 396, 401, 406
plumb line, 381, 383, 386, 388
Plutarch, 83*n*, 111*n*, 307, 327–328, 346, 383
Pluto, 101
Poe, Edgar Allan, 40
poetry, 315, 408, 418–421
  Lyric, 200
  metrical requirements of Greek, 27
  as mimetic art, 115
  oral, 204
  sculpture and, 115
pole-lathe, 352–353
polis, 65
polished, 343–344
Pollitt, J.J., 360, 362, 365, 366–367, 369–371, 372, 374–375, 380, 395, 417
Pollux, 36
polychromy, 49, 81, 126, 172, 175, 176–178
  of textiles, 327
Polydorus, 248, 316
Polygnotus, 254, 255, 261
  Group of, 254
Polygnotus of Thasos, 210–214, 215–217, 230
polygonal masonry, 92, 96
Polykleitos, 216, 394–395, 417, 422
  Canon of, 196*n*, 227–228, 380, 394–397
Polymestor, 316, 330

Polyneices, 123, 133, 234, 237, 291*n*
Polyphemus, 98*n*, 100, 369–370
polysemy, 394
Polyxena, 113, 147–150, 165, 173, 212, 215–217, 364
Polyxena sarcophagus, 150*n*, 215
Pompeii, 217, 238
Poole, Adrian, 21–22
porch columns, 71
porches, 60, 89
Porphyry, 407–408
Porter, W.H., 333
porticoes, 59–60, 75, 76, 306, 307*n*, 342*n*
Poseidon, 1, 5, 10, 15, 23, 24, 53, 74*n*, 101, 108, 109, 112–113, 138, 280–281, 388, 416–417
  temple of, at Sounion, 112, 299
Praxias, 287
Praxiteles, 146, 194, 402
Praxithea, 360
Preiser, Claudia, 341
Priam, 4, 5, 14, 15, 17, 24, 26, 27, 35, 113, 119
Primavesi, Oliver, 175–176, 376, 379
Procleon, 313
Procopius, 65*n*
Proetus, 99, 100
prolepsis, 344
Prometheus, 13, 422
proportion, 395
Propylaea, 282, 300*n*, 307
  picture gallery of, 210, 216
prostyle buildings, 71, 72–73
Protesilaos, 170, 244
Proteus, 35, 155, 344
prototypes, 374, 375, 376
protractor, 389
Ptolemy II Philadelphius, 314
Pucci, Pietro, 4, 147
pycnostyle temples, 45
Pygmalion myth, 413
Pylades, 51, 54, 55, 66, 69–71, 72, 73, 151, 153, 171, 212, 326, 345
Pythagoras of Rhegion, 362, 366
Pythia, 335
pyxis, 173, 253

Quintilian, 217, 228

Rabinowitz, Nancy, 148, 276–277
rafters, 57
Raman, Rahim A., 345–346
Raphael, 199
Rehm, Rush, xi, 6, 22, 125, 252, 412
relief, 234*n*, 374, 379–380, 405–406
  neo-Attic, 46, 151
  stelai, 202–203
Rembrandt van Rijn, 231, 270
Renaissance, 193, 239, 405
Renoir, Pierre-Auguste, 233
repoussé, 379
Rhesus, 332–333, 376
rhythmos, 366
Rich Style, 154
ridgepoles, 40, 63
Rijksbaron, Albert, 351, 353
Robertson, Edward Stanley, 352, 353
rock, 120, 121, 123, 125, 193, 332
Romantics, 206
Rome, 17*n*, 145, 229, 270, 289, 404
  illusionistic space in art of, 198–199
  painting in, 198, 208
  Republican, 422
  Roman Empire, 351
roofs, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 89
  domestic, 40
  of the Parthenon, 342*n*
  temple, 342
Roux, Georges, 70
ruddled line, *see* chalk line
ruler, 381, 382, 386, 388–389
rungs, periphrasis for, 33–34
running drill, 357–358
Rutherford, Ian, 287–288, 293

Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Chrysoula, 43, 45–47
Sage, Michael M., 135
St. Clair, William, 49
Salamis, battle of, 88
"Salamis" (Solon), 33
Samos, 238
Sansone, David, 69–70, 199

Sappho, 94, 277, 323
satyr plays, 306, 403, 408
satyrs, 270, 363, 370, 408*n*
schema Alcmanicum, 248*n*
"School of Athens" (Raphael), 199
scientia, 422
Scodel, Ruth, 148, 149
Scopas, 401, 421
Scranton, Robert L., 81
scratchings, 241
sculpture, 115–194, 315, 372, 374–375, 421, 422
  agalmata and, 172
  Archaic, 290, 404–405, 407–408
  architectural, 294–295, 299
  Classical, 290, 405, 407–408, 412
  dancing women in, 154–155
  developmental history of Greek, 195
  Early Classical, 366, 404
  form in, 235
  in Greek daily life, 115, 117
  Hellenistic, 162
  in-the-round, 376, 380
  maquettes in production of, 374
  as mimetic art, 115
  pedimental, 290
  poetry and, 115
  relief and, 405–406
  representation of statues in, 128
  see also, statues
Scyros, 212–213
Seaford, Richard, 353
seats, trapezoidal wooden, 76
Segal, Charles, 375
Serapis, 57*n*
Seven against Thebes, the, 53, 137
shading, 230–231
Shamash, 385
shapes, 366, 370
Shapiro, H.A., 220
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 244, 292, 432
shrines, domestic, 132–133
Sicily, 100*n*
  expedition to, 11*n*, 87, 89, 335
Sienkewicz, Thomas J., 114
Sikes, E.E., 289
Sikyon, 236
Silenus, 17, 97, 260, 269–270, 401
Silius Italicus, 131*n*
sima, 53
Simoeisius, 355
Simonides, 111
Sinclair, T.S., 349
Siphnian treasury, 283, 295, 299
skene, 9, 259*n*
skenographia, of Classical stage, 198
sketching, 237–238, 241
skiagraphia, 230, 231, 233–235
skyphos, 26, 318
snakes, 297, 309–311, 320
Socrates, xvi–xvii, 18*n*, 174, 260, 262, 360, 367, 383, 407, 420–421, 422, 424
  on color, 199
  Parrhasios and, 209, 261, 263–265
  as sculptor, xiv, 151
  and visual arts, 196, 197, 221, 337, 426–427, 433
Solon, 33, 363
Sophia, 416
sophia, 417–419, 422–423
Sophists, 229, 261, 416, 425–426, 427, 430, 433
Sophocles, ix, xi–xii, xiv, xxi, xxiii, 50, 65*n*, 90, 91, 99, 105, 116, 173, 199, 229, 240, 253, 257, 276, 315–316, 343, 364, 380, 385, 386, 387, 393, 418, 422, 423, 430–431
  Ajax, 20, 83, 87
  Antigone, 59, 122
  Electra, 234
  Oedipus at Colonus, 346
  Oedipus the King, 20, 21, 89, 167
  Philoctetes, 282
  Women of Trachis, 87, 153, 181
  sophos, 418, 424–426
Sophroniscus, xiv
Sounion, 112, 299
Sparta, Spartans, 11*n*, 16, 18, 95, 111, 112, 171, 177
sphyrelata, 377
Spisak, Art L., xvii
springback, 350
Stageira, 81

statues, 309, 374
  aesthetics of, 145–161
  Andromeda mistaken for, 146, 167, 391, 400–401, 405–406, 415
  Archaic, 126–128, 292
  of athletes, 156
  bases of, 29–30, 129
  bronze, 129, 141, 345–347
  chryselephantine, 132, 142, 377
  Classical, 124, 126, 155, 176, 412
  Classical male, 149–150, 156
  corpses vs., 123–124
  cult, 132–134, 137, 142, 309
  gilded, 142–145
  in Greek daily life, 115, 117
  Hellenistic, 124
  imagined, 162–172
  mechanics and aesthetics of, 400
  nudity of female, 145–151, 158
  nudity of male, 153, 156
  in open air at Delphi, 346
  polychromy of, 172, 175, 176–178
  Polyxena in, 215
  representations of, 128
  Roman copies of, 154
  sacred, 143
  "speaking", 148, 193
  votive, 144
  wet drapery on, 154–155, 157–158
  wooden, 377
  see also sculpture
Steiner, Deborah Tarn, xi, 116, 170, 223, 413
stelai, relief, 202–203
steps, 26–27, 89
Stesichorus, 172
  "Palinode" of, 169–170
Stevens, Gorham Phillips, 364–365
stichomythia, 371
Stoa Poikile, 213
stone, 54, 56, 66*n*, 124, 192, 288, 289, 343–344, 359, 400, 401, 402, 406, 422
  removal of superfluous, 404
  unhewn, 33
Strabo, 100, 197, 221
strap drill, 357–358
Strauss, Richard, 276
string line, 381, 385, 388
Strongylion, 186–192
Strozzi, Giovanni di Carlo, 103
Studius, 207, 209
"Stumbling Niobid", 145, 149–150
stylobate, 26, 30, 49, 52, 89, 289
Styros, 64*n*
sublimity, 185, 406
summetria, 366
superstructures, 48–84
suppliants, 132, 136
supporting members, 36–48
symposia, 273, 426–427
synaesthesia, xv
Syracuse, 131*n*
syrinx, 398
systyle temples, 45

Talos Painter, 233*n*
Talthybius, 9, 148, 322, 334
tapestry weaving, 277, 308–309
Taplin, Oliver, xxii, 276
Tarquinia National Museum, 272
Taureans, 51
Taurus, 152
technê, 221, 223, 417, 422
Tecmessa, 87
teichoskopia, 232
Teiresias, 106–107
Telemachos, 284, 318
telemon, 378
Telephos frieze, 357
Telephus, 340, 341
Telesterion, 74
templates, 375, 376
Temple of Ares and Athena, 154
temples, 27, 49, 52, 70
  Alcmaeonid, 286–287, 289–291, 295, 300
  araeostyle, 45
  Archaic, 279, 287, 289, 294–295
  Classical, 74, 178
  decoration of, 290–291, 294–295, 299

diastyle, 45
Doric, 69, 301
ephemeral, 288
eustyle, 45
in antis, 72–73
Ionic, 71, 73, 281
peripteral, 71–73, 301
Phthian, 16, 62
pycnostyle, 45
roofs of, 342
steps of, 26
stone, 56
systyle, 45
temples, *see also specific gods*
Tereus, 315–316
Terme Museum, 145, 149
terracotta groups, Classical, 271
Teucer, 155, 399
textiles, 275–278, 302–336, 308, 309, 312, 314
Near Eastern, 328–331
polychromed, 327
votive, 311–312
Thebes, Thebans, 39, 106, 125, 133, 136, 157, 178, 232, 304n, 344, 365
towers of, 107
walls of, 33–34, 93–94, 105, 414
Themistoclean walls, of Athens, 17
Themistocles, 18*n*, 88–89, 327–338
Theognis, 20, 269, 383
Theophrastus, 101*n*
theoria, 295
Theramenes, 86
Theron, 37
Theseus, 239–240, 257–258, 259, 338, 368, 377
Thessaly, 32
Thetis, 118*n*, 130–132, 152, 269, 318
statue of, 119–120, 123, 125–132
Thompson, Homer, 32
Thracians, 330
"Three Graces", 151
threnodies, 178
Thucydides, 18*n*, 21, 65, 111, 224–225, 327, 330, 373, 429
Thyestes, 296, 319, 333–334
thyrsus, 75
Timaenetus, 210
Timanthes, 217–218
time, media based in, 366
representation of, 324–325
Timotheus, 374–375
Tiryns, 16, 91–92, 95, 99, 100
Palace at, 31
Titans, 322
Tithonus, 108
tomb markers, 37*n*
tomb monuments, Lycian, 205–206
tombs:
Bronze age, 15
New Kingdom Theban, 348
polishing of, 343–344
towers, 19, 21, 48, 82*n*, 101, 104–110
of Thebes, 107
of Troy, 7, 22, 344
Treasury of the Athenians, 71, 181, 183, 297, 301
Trell, Bluma L., 56, 73
triglyphs, 65, 67–71, 74, 288*n*, 301
Doric, 66
friezes, 51, 66*n*, 69, 73
tripods, 66*n*
Trojan horse, 14*n*, 185–192, 343
Trojan war, 152, 169, 208, 212, 216, 245, 249
trompe-l'oeil, 208–209
Trophonius, 288
Troy, Trojans, 79, 86, 109, 112, 126, 169, 170, 212, 217, 244, 248, 267, 268, 269, 270, 273, 316, 355, 399, 412
apostrophizing of, 5
architecture of, 57, 113
destruction of, 5, 11, 17*n*, 28–29, 109–111, 185, 248, 273
personification of, 4, 5
ruins of, 7, 82–84, 110–111
temples of, 143
topography of, 2, 3, 12–16
towers of, 7, 22, 344
walls of, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12–13, 17, 28, 50, 81–82, 87, 97, 104, 105, 107, 108, 112–113, 119, 390–391, 417

Trozen, 60, 133
Turkey, 215
Tyche, 80
Tyche of Antioch, 80
tympanum, 299
Typhon, 39
Tyre, 143
Tyrrell, Robert Y., 79, 82, 108, 352

Uccello, Paolo, 233

Vasari, Giorgio, 193, 405
vase painting, ix, 179, 183, 205, 213, 241–254, 247, 272, 273–274
  character in, 255
  decoration in, 318
  Dionysiac iconography in, 255–256
  eroticism in, 222–223
  genre vignettes in, 247, 249–250
  graphic skills in, 241
  landscape and, 213
  personification of times of day in, 252–254
  Polyxena in, 215
  pornographic, 222–223
  of scenes from *IT*, 345
  theft of the Palladium in, 345*n*
vases, 145, 161, 200
  Archaic, 246, 247
  Attic, 246*n*, 249, 251, 271, 272, 370
  black-figure, 245, 246, 250
  Classical, 247, 249–250, 256, 271
  facial expressions and, 272–273
  Geometric, 199
  Meidian, 251–252
  red-figure, 242, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 256, 271, 370, 382, 386
  representations of statues in, 128
  white lekythoi, 248, 252
  white-ground funerary, 202, 242, 251, 252
verandas, 31
verdigris, 345
Vergina (Aigai), 42
Verrall, A.W., 305, 311, 392
Villa of Agrippa Posthumous, 207
Villa Farnesina, 207
Virgil, 102–103
  Aeneid, 284, 412
Vitruvius, 44, 45, 47, 61, 65, 67–68, 70, 208, 210, 229–230, 260, 406
votive statues, 144

Wagener, Anthony, 204
Wagner, Richard, 199
wall capitals, 42*n*
walls, 16–23, 48, 51, 57*n*, 60, 72, 80–81, 84, 89
  of Argos, 12, 16, 91, 100, 104
  ashlar stone, 35
  of Athens, 17–18, 95, 342*n*
  Bronze age, 93
  walls, in Classical period, 18
  isodomic stone, 35
  music and, 93–95
  of Mycenae, 81, 95, 96, 99, 100, 390
  ship hull as, 85
  symbolic value of, 19
  of Thebes, 33–34, 93–94, 105, 414
  of Troy, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12–13, 17, 28, 50, 81–82, 87, 97, 104, 105, 107, 108, 112–113, 119, 390–391, 417
Washburn, Oliver M., 69, 73
water spouts, lion head, 74–75
watercolor, 241–242
weaving, 315–336, 382
  by men, 277*n*–278*n*, 311–312
  deceit and, 316–317
  domestic vs. industrial, 275*n*
  figured, 315, 318–319
  as metaphor, 276–277, 331–334
  patterns and colors in, 317–318, 325–331
  Phrygian, 329–331
  plaiting vs., 278*n*
  "singing shuttle" topos and, 315–316
  tapestry, 277n
  technical terms in, 319

tent, and second ekphrasis in *Ion*, 302–314, 315, 316, 319–320, 324
as token of proof, 319–320
trust and, 316
women and, 275–277, 296, 326
Webster, T.B.L., x, 206, 282–283
Weihgeschenk, 153*n*
West, M.L., 56, 349
wheels, wheelwrights, 347–355, 415*n*
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, 30–32, 105, 136, 138, 185, 237, 280, 284, 286, 303, 409–410
Wilkins, John, 138
Willink, C.W., 54–56, 326, 334, 340
Wilson, John R., 185–186
Winckelmann, Johann Joachim, 66, 70, 271
windows, 70, 73
Winnington-Ingram, R.P., 286, 418
Wisdom (Sophia), 251
women:
beauty in, 150, 155–156, 162, 215
eroticism and, 147–148, 151
objectification of, 155–156
weaving and, 275–277, 296, 326
wood, 54, 66*n*, 192, 289, 341, 343, 354–359, 402
bending of, 355
cypress, 64, 342, 354
Woodford, Susan, 246
woodworking, 341, 342, 414–415, 419
wool, carding of, 331–332
Wordsworth, Christopher, 75
Wycherley, R.F., 32, 389

Xanthakis-Karamanos, Georgia, 147
Xenophon, 95, 362, 429
Memorabilia of, 261, 263, 265, 367, 369, 422
Xuthus, 226, 279, 280, 288, 302, 316

Zeitlin, Froma, xi, 219–220, 223, 286
Zenobius, 278*n*
Zethus, 94, 423–424
Zeus, 53, 93, 94, 101, 102, 107–108, 136–137, 138, 139, 151, 168, 171, 222, 240, 269–271, 273, 281, 302, 321, 363–364, 399, 423
altar of, 303, 357
Pheidias' cult statue of, 122
statues of, 144
temple of, at Athens, 14, 271
temple of, at Marathon, 140
temple of, at Nemea, 294, 296, 379
temple of, at Olympia, 59, 179, 181, 184, 297, 404
Zeus Basileus, 138
Zeus Herkeios, altar of, 24, 27*n*, 35, 39*n*, 113, 132, 136
Zeus Tropaios, 135
Zeuxis, 209, 217, 233, 422
Zuntz, Günther, 138

EURIPIDES PASSAGE INDEX

Alc.
5–6 102
162 133
164 133
244–272 252
311 22
347–354 163, 167, 170
348 414, 415
348–349 306
349–350 167, 168
353 414
365–366 164
381 338
457 57
481–496 181
481–498 183
591–594 252
640 258
771 338
836 344
897–899 166
912 364
962–963 425
962–969 xxii
973–975 133
985 134
991–994 169
1059 168
1085 338
1143 411

Andr. 117, 125, 127, 145, 407
1 364
66 333
85 333
114–116 120–121
115–116 122, 129
166–167 339
246 126
266–268 128, 129
273–274 120
311 129
447 222
511–512 166
532–534 120, 122, 129
537 120
549 333
644 338
770 333
851 339
859 132
911 333
938 171
983 333
995 333
1009–1010 108
1010 105
1014–1015 108, 416
1078 413
1111–1112 25
1116 333
1121 61–62
1135 201
1226–1227 130, 131
1284 131–132

Ba. 47, 266, 350
7 83
172 107
185 107
218 339
395 418
438–439 255–256
448 64
469–472 371
471 371–372
587–593 40
591 38, 76, 78, 391n
591–592 75

Ba. (*cont.*),
602–603 40
633 40, 57–58
639 60
645 60
821 157
831 160
832 363
833 158, 161
934 158
935–938 158
1021 255–256
1064 356
1066–1067 347, 351, 355, 356, 357
1067 351, 352, 354
1214 73
1240 75
1331 379, 380

Cy. 101–102
15 303
115 17, 105
115–118 97
220–221 363, 369
339 333
351–352 29
385 270
394 343
398 365, 369, 370
411 407–408
415 407
451–463 358
460–463 356
477–478 306, 307, 416
563 365, 370
579–589 269
586 270
608–610 340
661 352, 356, 358

El.
52–53 388
55–56 249–250
57–58 250
305 345, 346
314 329
317–318 330
387–388 156
465–466 252
527–537 xvii
538–540 317
550–551 257
558–559 257
572 257
608 30
671 135
706–707 33, 90
772 365
866 252
1037 398
1072–1073 339
1084–1085 372–373, 394
1150 391n
1150–1151 52
1158 91
1280–1283 169
1321 165

Fragments
25.2–3 (*Aiolos*) 362
25.3 (*Aiolos*) 399
62h (*Alexandros*) 155
89 (*Alcmene*) 86
114 (*Androm.*) 252
125 (*Androm.*) 146, 150, 167, 306, 400–401, 403–404, 415
125.3 (*Androm.*) 391
126 (*Androm.*) 401
186 (*Antiope*) 423–424
188 (*Antiope*) 424
198 (*Antiope*) 425
199 (*Antiope*) 424
200 (*Antiope*) 424

202 (*Antiope*) 424
203 (*Antiope*) 38n
210.2 (*Antiope*) 363, 399
223.90–95 (*Antiope*) 94, 424
228.5 (*Arch.*) 252
282.10–11 (*Autolykos*) 156–157, 422–423
285.16 (*Bell.*) 395
286.15 (*Bell.*) 110
290 (*Bell.*) 423
296.2 (*Bell.*) 339
298.1 (*Bell.*) 339
303.4 (*Bell.*) 389
305.1 (*Bell.*) 343
351 (*Erec.*) 141
360.12 (*Erec.*) 342
360.26–27 (*Erec.*) 361
360.46 (*Erec.*) 141
360.47 (*Erec.*) 28, 281
369.5 (*Erec.*) 40
369.6 (*Erec.*) xxii
370.39–40 (*Erec.*) 281
370.49–54 (*Erec.*) 40
370.59–60 (*Erec.*) 281
370.91 (*Erec.*) 391n
372 (*Eurystheus*) 412
372.2–3 (*Eurystheus*) 306, 411, 415
376 (*Eurystheus*) 392
382.3–4 (*Theseus*) 352
386 (*Theseus*) 156
431 N^2 240
472.8 (*Cret.*) 342
476 (*Likymnios*) 365
481.9–11 (*Mel.S.*) 279
494.15 (*Mel.D.*) 27
528a (*Meleager*) 315
540.7 (*Oed.*) 252
588a (*Palam.*) 344
618 (*Peleus*) 173–174
644.3 (*Polyeidos*) 372
688.2 (*Syleus*) 363
727 (*Tel.*) 340
752c (*Hyps.*) 178, 294, 295–296
752f.8 (*Hyps.*) xvii
752f.9–14 (*Hyps.*) 315
752f.32–33 (*Hyps.*) 94
759c (*Hyps.*) 379
771.2–3 (*Pha.*) 252
771.4–5 (*Pha.*) 252
773.19–20 (*Pha.*) 252
773.19–42 (*Pha.*) 205–207, 209, 214
781.222 (*Pha.*) 344
781.246–247 (*Pha.*) 133
781.354 (*Pha.*) 343
828.21 (*Phryxos*) 21
842 (*Chrys.*) 262, 423
928a.2–3 (incert.) 376, 379
929 (incert.) 252
988 (*Cret.* [incert.]) 414
1041 (incert.) 174

Hec.
254 90
379–380 257
410 165
465 143
466–470 322
466–472 321
466–474 323
467–470 324
470 409
470–471 322
472–474 322
473–474 324
485 322
560–561 147–150, 215, 218
569 149, 364
590 173, 174
601–602 393
602 396
619 364
807 59n
807–808 202n
826–827 165
836–838 316, 412–413
905–952 248
910–912 81

Hec. (*cont.*)
920 249
1151–1154 330
1209–1210 17

Hel. 117
31–36 171
32 170
34 170
51 105
70 51
73–75 399
262–263 172–173, 177
341–342 252
379 363
430 51
547 30, 35
570 134
583 171
584 170
585 171, 339
605 170
705 170, 171
750 170
875 399
940 398
962 391
985–986 166
986 344
1093 168
1219 170, 171
1573 85
1652 28
1674–1675 84

Heracl. 30, 132, 181, 392
130 365
130–131 369
295–296 393n
352 283
614 338
631–632 38n–39n
655–672 258
695–696 62n
748–783 138
752–754 139
753 138, 140
754 138
771 140
772 140
786 135
858 379, 380
867 135
936–937 135
973 38
977 38
1002–1006 141
1006 38
1011 38
1038 38
1096 38

HF 50
15 91
49 136
131 263
238 106, 304
243 303, 304
285 332
293 106
294 398
348–435 178, 251
355 179
357–358 182
380–386 183
425 156, 182
465–466 182–183
470–471 409
471 411
475 105
582 178
611 179
637–641 39
673–675 150–151
673–686 425
715 24
782 344
825 39
883 263
905–908 40
922–1015 179–180
944 28, 91, 96

945 390
977–978 358
978 352
979 391n
980 35
985 30
991–994 410
992 399
998 91
999 63–64
1004 125
1006 391
1006–1008 40
1008 30
1037 391n
1096 391
1118 237–241
1261–1262 26
1271–1272 184
1271–1280 180
1280 50
1298 399
1306 30
1331–1333 125
1332 391n
1376–1385 410
1397 125, 413

Hipp. 117, 132
32–33 136
73–87 133, 142–143, 178
101 133
114 398
115–116 133
201 42
274 332
373–374 60
418 57
451 222
468–469 58
490 364
536 57
631–631 155
639 136, 156
768 57
809 343
862 377
923 338
925–931 257
954 xxii
984–985 259
1004–1005 222
1148 150
1225 342
1232–1235 350
1241 174
1399 133

IA xxiii
152 91
156–159 252
164–302 243
189–190 244
194–198 244, 246–248
195 244
196–197 244
239–241 155
265 91
534 91
548 143
578 397
705 28
774 342, 391n
788–790 315
983 363
1049–1053 269, 273
1501 91
1550 217–218

Ion xx, 91, 205, 275–336
9 141
10–27 278
25 339
38 26
41 252
82–85 252
82–88 285
122 252
156 52
171 52
184–204 298

Ion (*cont.*)
184–236 284
185 41, 44, 47, 48
186–187 291
188–189 291–293
190 297, 298, 299
191–204 297
196–197 296
201 299
204 298
205–206 295, 300
205–218 300
206 295, 299
206–207 299, 300
210–211 141
211 302
219 298
230–231 284
235–236 280
236 284
238 363
240 363
245–246 284
249–251 302
271 219–220
273 219
281–282 280–281
300 288, 290
451 398
452–457 281
452–460 281
460 283
497–498 279
510 26
585–586 226
936–949 278
992–996 141
992 363
1048 134
1085 134, 178
1133 35
1134 35, 309
1137 393
1139 416
1148–1151 252
1150–1151 253
1158 309n
1159 313
1267 81
1306 339
1321 52
1392 339
1429 399
1433–1436 281
1480 281
1514 392
1528–1529 324
1529 282
1580–1581 141

IT 117, 137, 153, 155
Prologue to 47, 48
34–41 37–38
47 50
49 40
50–55 37
50 38, 40
51 49
51–52 41–42
57 38, 40
69 51
72–73 51
74 74
74–75 51
85–90 118
87–88 118
96–97 73
111–112 119, 345
113–114 66, 68–71, 73
128–129 41, 43–48, 49
216–217 152
219 324
222–224 315, 322, 324
224 324
246 363
273–274 120–121, 151–152
292 363

294 397
312 326
625–626 51n
681 331
698 174
772 367
774–858 367
811–817 296, 317–318, 334
816 319
817 319
838–843 367
842–843 367
845 91
870–871 393n
951 338
962 33, 90
977 118
997 391n
1010 69
1157–1158 29, 345
1158 119
1159 61
1165 412
1167 412
1201 29
1223 119
1453 135–136, 338
1464–1467 326

Med. 157
155–156 240
194 403
196 403
219–221 260
390 22
409 416
516–519 257
526 106
584 364
659–661 258
786 159n
825–865 251
835–845 142
844–845 416
901–902 203
956 252n
983 159n
1030 332
1039 363
1072 363
1156 252n
1159 159n
1160 161
1161 159, 363
1162 123
1164–1166 158
1165–1166 159
1188–1189 159n
1315 343

Or.
12–13 333
621 340
648 17
820 340
840 326, 329
891–892 334
965 91, 101
1001–1004 252, 253
1053 166
1201 338
1370–1372 55–56, 65
1371–1372 70
1371 59
1372 xx
1374 56
1386–1387 83
1387–1388 344
1391 269
1427–1430 xviii
1431–1436 334
1457 326
1474 63
1476 63
1494–1495 171
1568 106
1569 52
1569–1570 53
1570 54, 304
1618 340n
1620 54–55
1625 339

Ph.
3 252
103–201 232
109 134
114 76–77
115 94
127–130 262
129–130 218
145 94
159–162 123
161–162 234, 236, 378
168 234, 378
191–192 143
220–221 143
250–252 362
281–282 144
287 105
333 57
415 61
572 135
631–632 133
823–824 94
982 27
1098 379
1104–1140 379
1130 376–377
1145 332
1157–1158 53
1179 33, 34, 344
1180 53
1250–1251 135
1372 141
1473 135
1485 161
1543–1545 124
1562–1563 252
1677 411n

Rh. xxiii
122 106
211 399
305 376–377
306–307 141
499 340
734–744 332
834 331
265, 266
959 338

Supp.
94 365
371 156
373 156
496–498 106
497 34
503 332
511–512 136
647 135
650 388
663 94
772 203
860 106
991–994 252
998 106
1020–1021 165
1054–1062 325–326
1163 156
1198 28
1221 105

Tr. xx, 50, 112, 113, 118–119, 132, 392
Ganymede Ode of, 267–273
Prologue to, 93
4–7 1
5 319n
6 388
9–14 185
11 190
13–14 185–187, 189
15 111
15–16 22
16 26–27
16–17 35
26–27 22
45–47, 5
46 344
47 28
93–97 368
95–97 109
96–97 22

102–104 84
116–119 84
118 38, 84, 87, 88
146–152 114
173 5
192–193 123, 125
196–197 315
205–206 250
206–207 321
211 321
215 32
338–339 329
357–358 268
359–360 84
364 84
365–366 84
370–371 268
376 104
403 5
449 166
461 84
470 363
489 49–50, 52, 78
534 191
506–509 78
507 315
508 81
509 82, 332
519–521 185–186, 189
525 185
533–539 185
534 190, 192, 343
540 391
551–560 248–249
575–576 62
601 5
612–613 108–109
661–663 259
686 84
687 221
747–748 316
760 332
778–779 268
780–781 268
780 5
783–784 81
795 5
799–820 28
799–829 97
814 390–391
815 391
821–824 269, 273
821–838 267
826–827 317
835–837 267
837 268, 270–271, 273
843–844 107
887–890 323
891–893 83
922 399
996–997 83
1022–1023 338
1025 82
1050 221
1065 13
1074 143, 377, 379–380
1087–1088 16, 96, 104
1088 91, 391n
1100–1117 86
1128–1165 302–303
1128 303, 304n
1129 304
1133 307
1137 304, 305–306
1137–1139 307
1138–1139 304–305, 306–307
1140 304
1141 307, 391n
1142 310, 312
1143 308, 309
1143–1145 312
1146 310, 312
1156 352
1158–1159 308–309
1159 311
1160–1161 81

Tr. (*cont.*)
1163 308, 309
1163–1165 310
1164 309–310
1165–1166 310
1166 309–310
1174 82, 105
1178–1179 400
1188–1191 4
1194–1199 411
1196 377
1197 352
1197–1199 377–378
1253 332
1256 9
1266 332
1276 5
1277–1279 5
1282–1283 5
1311 4
1322 4
1323–1324 5
1325 5
1410 317
1418 317
1419 325, 327
1421 319
1423 319
1528–1529 321, 323
1528 324